F.W. Fowler

An Answer to Bishop Colenso

BS1225
.4.C7F8

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 15 1959
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
BS1225
.A7F8

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 11 19
THEOLOGICAL SEM

VINDEX PENTATEUCHI.

AN ANSWER

(SERIATIM)

TO BISHOP COLENSO

ON

The Pentateuch.

BY THE

REV. F. W. FOWLER, B.A.,

St. John's College, Cambridge, and Curate of Bathwick.

"ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God."—2 TIM. iii. 16.

LONDON:
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, and CO., STATIONERS' HALL COURT.
BATH: R. E. PEACH, 8, BRIDGE STREET.
CHELTENHAM: G. A. WILLIAMS.

Price Two Shillings.

BS1225
.A.C7F8

LIBRARY OF PRINCE
APR 11 192
THEOLOGICAL SEM

VINDEX PENTATEUCHI.

AN ANSWER

(SERIATIM)

TO BISHOP COLENSO

ON

The Pentateuch.

BY THE

REV. F. W. FOWLER, B.A.,

St. John's College, Cambridge, and Curate of Bathwick.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."—2 Tim. iii. 16.

LONDON:
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, and CO., STATIONERS' HALL COURT.
BATH: R. E. PEACH, 8, BRIDGE STREET.
CHELTENHAM: G. A. WILLIAMS.

MDCCCLXII.

PREFACE.

The well-known talents and virtues of Bishop Colenso, as well as his sacred office in the Church, have commanded for his work on the Pentateuch, a wide-spread circulation. Moreover, the plainness of his charges, together with the apparent correctness of his conclusions, which seem to amount to a demonstration, have unsettled the minds, and shaken the faith, of many hitherto sincere believers in God's word. For these reasons alone, an answer, and that a seriatim one, is imperatively, and almost unanimously, demanded.

Besides these, there are reasons of far deeper importance, which make an answer of such kind still more necessary. The Bishop's conclusions involve, if admitted, the surrender of the whole Bible, and a consequent relapse into natural religion. Such a result the Bishop evidently contemplates as possible, both in the beginning and end of his book. Thus he writes in his Introductory Remarks, at page 12: "Our belief in the living God remains as sure as ever, though not the Pentateuch only, but the whole Bible, were removed. It is written on our hearts, by God's own finger, as surely as by the hand of the Apostle in the Bible, that 'GOD IS, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' It is written there also, as plainly as in the Bible, that 'God is not mocked,' that 'whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap,' and that 'he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption.'" So again, in the same page, he writes, "It is, perhaps, God's will that we shall be taught in this our day, among other precious lessons, not to build up our faith upon a book, though it be the Bible itself, but to realize more

truly the blessedness of knowing that he himself, the living God, our Father and Friend, is nearer and closer to us than any book can be, that His voice within the heart may be heard continually by the obedient child that listens for it, and *that* shall be our teacher and guide in the path of duty, which is the path of life, when all other helpers—even the words of the Best of Books—may fail us."

All this, is, in other words, that a return to Natural Religion—to Reason and Conscience—as the Bishop puts it in his concluding remarks, is probable; but we say that such is far more than a probability. On the Bishop's principles, this is not a possibility, but a certainty; it is not merely probable, but necessary. It is not a "may be," as he has it, but a "must be." For if parts of the Pentateuch are incredible and impossible, what possible confidence can any rational being have in the rest? The Pentateuch must at once be excluded from the Canon of Holy Scripture. And when we further find that the Pentateuch is quoted and alluded to, not only by Old Testament writers, but by our blessed Lord himself, repeatedly, as being of divine authority, what faith can we longer have in the inspiration of the New? Give up the Law, and you give up the Gospel too. It answers nothing to this, to say with the Bishop, that perhaps the wisdom of our Lord's Humanity was "gradual and limited." (Preface, p. xxxi.) Granting this were the case, who shall venture to decide when He is speaking to us as fallible man, and when as infallible God? But whether this be the case or no, it has nothing to do with the matter; for it is certain our blessed Lord himself declares that He speaks to us in his omniscient Divinity. His truth is always positive and certain. "I am the way, the truth, and the life." So He saith, "Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." So again, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father, in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake." (John xiv. 5, xii. 50, xiv. 10, 11.) Such words as these leave no room for supposing that he speaks in other than His Godhead; the words of the Father Almighty Himself, because "He and the Father are one." (John x. 30.) When, therefore, he appeals

to the Scriptures, (which always included the writings of Moses) and containing everlasting life; when he allows the practices of the Mosaic law; when he classes Moses and the prophets together, as testifying of Himself; he speaks and can speak no otherwise than as God. And yet, according to Bishop Colenso, those writings are *not* Moses', are *not* real history, but are, much of them, "incredible, impossible, and historically untrue." We must then, on the Bishop's principles, go back to Natural Religion, to Reason and Conscience. The very thought must make every Christian shudder. We are to have reason instead of revelation; conscience instead of grace. This at once destroys all the light, the holiness, and the comfort conveyed by the dispensation of Christ. We must go back to reason's Gods—Jupiter, Venus, and Moloch, and idols of wood and stone; the gods of the savage African and ignorant Zulu. Where, we may ask, did reason ever teach one blessed, hopeful, comforting truth? What heathen ever got much beyond the troubling doubt about hereafter—*Se quis piorum Manibus locus?* What *can*, in fact, Reason ever tell us with certainty, of immortality and life? It is to supply what reason cannot—to throw light on darkness, that Revelation is wanted and given. Where Reason ends, Revelation begins. And what, again, has Conscience, unaided by grace, ever done to raise and ennoble mankind? Rather it has left him sunk in the vilest slough of pride, passion, and sensualism—a mere material clay—the debased and degraded animal being of St. Paul (Romans i.); without care or thought beyond the body and the world, who had better "eat and drink, for to-morrow he dies." Such is the end of letting go, even the least part of God's written word; the religion of Midian; the degradation of man.

There is one other unhappy consequence arising from the work; one which a man of the Bishop's piety could never contemplate, and still less, desire. It is, that his work should become the text-book for each filthy jest and scoffing sneer; the Unbeliever's *Vade-Mecum*; the Free-thinker's Bible. This dark and fatal cloud, however, now hangs upon it, and has, in part descended.

All will allow that these are weighty reasons for an answer, and that a speedy one. Nevertheless, the writer of these pages, would never have read the Bishop's book, still less have attempted a reply,

if it had not come to him in the way of duty. He thankfully confesses, that undisturbed by doubts himself, he has never troubled himself with reading the doubts of others. But the book was put, nay, forced into his hand by a friend. His attention was called to two of its objections, and the question asked, "How can you possibly get over such impossibilities as these?" This question, coming from one who had always shewn a deep religious feeling, could not pass unnoticed. He felt it a sacred call of duty to consider the objections, and give such answer as he could to them. He also felt, and further experience has convinced him he is right therein, that there might be many humble and pious souls, whose faith had been rudely shaken to its very foundations. Such was the reason for his present attempt, and he humbly hopes that God may bless it.

Most Holy and Blessed Spirit, whose it is to take of the things of Christ and shew them unto man; Guide us, we pray thee, into all truth; Keep us grounded and settled in the faith, that we may be built up an holy temple acceptable unto God, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

F. W. FOWLER.

Bathwick, December 3, 1862.

BISHOP COLENSO'S OBJECTIONS REVIEWED.

OBJECTION I.

THE PUNISHMENT FOR BEATING A SERVANT TO DEATH.

THE Mosaic Law for the punishment of the above offence is this:

"If a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money." Exodus xxi. 20, 21.

Commenting on this passage, the Bishop tells us of the "revulsion of feeling" with which a Christian native received these words: "How his whole soul revolted against the notion that the great and blessed God, the merciful Father of all mankind, would speak of a servant or maid as mere 'money,' and allow a horrible crime to go unpunished, because the victim of the brutal usage had survived a few hours." And he adds for himself, "My own heart and conscience at the time fully sympathized with his." (Colenso's Introductory Remarks, page 9.) So we may understand the Bishop to mean, that he regards this as an unrighteous and cruel law.

Now we answer, that first, this law does *not* sanction "brutal usage" on the master's part. It must be interpreted in connection with such other laws regarding servants as these: "Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour;" (Leviticus xxv. 43.) "Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him." (Exodus xxii. 21.) The whole Mosaic law inculcated a like merciful dealing. It cannot, then, for an instant be supposed that the "smiting" here referred to, means a random or violent beating, at the mere will and passion of the master. To be consonant to the above two laws, it must neither be inflicted with a cruel instrument, nor in excess. And such a power of chastisement, circumstances, and social relations between master and servant, might render not only right and proper, but even necessary. Thus *ex. gr.* it is easy to conceive that on a march, opportunities for theft might be frequent, and require to be summarily dealt with, especially since the servants were probably of the savage hordes of Canaan.

These considerations, we think, show, that a law which at first sight appears severe, is not so of necessity, and, in discussing a law three thousand years old, our ignorance of the state of society which called it forth, prevents our being good judges of its nature, and—in such ignorance—ought we not, if it be a Divine law, to accept it as righteous, for "shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" (Genesis xviii. 25.) But the Bishop contends the law is not righteous, therefore it *is not* Divine. We, on the other hand, contend that the law is Divine, and therefore *is* righteous. We will now try to establish this proposition, by showing that the law bears on the very face of it, the stamp of both righteousness and mercy. It is righteous thus: it distinguishes, in punishing, between *intentional* and *unintentional* homicide. If a brutal master beat his servant with such cruelty that he died under his hand, he was punished, and with death; for the Hebrew word rendered "punished" signifies "avenged," as given in the margin of the English version; and this surely was a righteous retribution. The law is also merciful; for if the beating were of such a nature as not to cause immediate

death, then the master *was punished*, but by the loss of his property only. This distinction between intentional and unintentional manslaying, the laws of all civilized nations—certainly those of England—recognize. The case occurred a few years ago, of a master beating his pupil in such manner that he died, *almost* under his hand. Revolting as this case was, yet as there was clearly no intention of murder, and as the "beating" was not of a nature to produce, except in extraordinary cases, death, the law inclined to mercy. Are we hence to infer that the law which allows moderate corporal punishment is "brutal?" Moreover in hot climates, death will often result from slight causes; a scratch or a prick often ends in erysipelas, fever, and death. The writer knew personally of such a case on the coast of Syria: it was that of a person whose flogging, though not cruel, and still less, dangerous, resulted in erysipelas, and he died a few days afterwards. The Mosaic law would mercifully prevent this and such like cases, being treated as murder; and thus, while protecting the servant from cruelty, it would also restrain that Eastern vice of revenge, which demanded life for life, even where life had been destroyed unintentionally.

To sum up. It has been shown, it is hoped, that the law objected to, if interpreted by the test of Moses' law, only allowed moderate, or we might rather say, *mild* discipline. Brutality causing death, was punished by death. In other cases, manslaughter was prevented from being treated as murder. And we therefore maintain it to have been both righteous and merciful.

This objection (with the exception of the war on Midian) is the only one which the Bishop makes on *moral* grounds. If proven, it would be, in the writer's opinion, the most serious. In noticing such objection, an inevitable digression is forced upon the mind. When a writer challenges the *morality* of Holy Scripture, we naturally enquire, what kind of morality do we get from him in return? Now we infer from the Bishop's preface (pages xxxiv. and xxxv., and note page xii.) that he is at least doubtful whether he ought to

resign his sacred office, unless legally compelled. Can any man of plain common sense have a doubt on the matter? Let us take the Bishop's case, using as the basis of our argument, the axiom, that no man has any *moral* right to betray a trust. Here is a man invested by the Church with her highest and most sacred office. He is, moreover, a Missionary Bishop, sent forth to convert the heathen. In return for these sacred privileges, there are laid on him certain equally sacred obligations. He is vowed at consecration to "instruct the people committed to his charge, out of holy scriptures." He is vowed to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word;" God's word being the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of which the Pentateuch is part. (vi. Article of Religion.) He is charged to "be to the flock of Christ a shepherd, not a wolf;" to "feed them, and devour them not." (Consecration Service.) How does the Bishop fulfil these weighty trusts? By attacking a part of those Holy Scriptures he is vowed to teach and maintain. And then he doubts, whether, if there be no *legal*, there be no *moral* obligation on him to resign. Surely this is to sweep away with "the besom of destruction" all principles of morality. The sense of honour forces men to fulfil faithfully many trusts, which the law could *not* enforce. For Law, imperfect to prevent crime, is almost powerless to prevent bad faith. Can the Bishop be unaware that the maxim, "Where there is no legal, there is no moral obligation," is the maxim of the dishonest? "It is my right," says the thief, "to plunder; it is the law's right to catch hold of me." With all respect for the Bishop's mathematical attainments, with all reverence for his sacred office, with all esteem for his zeal and devotion—and this all who know him will say is less than his due—deeply and sincerely sympathising with the "pain it would cause him to leave the work committed to his charge" (Colenso, preface, page xiii.)—we must yet protest against a doctrine that uproots every principle of duty, honor, and good faith, and which has caused, and is causing, such scandal and mischief to Christ's church.*

* See Answer to Objection, "War on Midian."

OBJECTION II.

THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.

"The Family of Judah" is the heading given by the Bishop to this objection; but we think the title of "Descent of Jacob and his household into Egypt," conveys a clearer idea of its nature. The substance of his objection is, that Hezron and Hamul were, according to Moses, *born in the land of Caanan*, and were among the seventy who *came into Egypt* with Jacob, and yet they could not possibly have been born until after the descent of Jacob, by Moses' own account.

ANSWER.

It must be granted that Hezron and Hamul were *not* born in the land of Canaan. Their father, Pharez, could not have been more than three or four years old when Jacob went down into Egypt. It is, therefore, "incredible," as the Bishop says, that they could have been born before that event. But we affirm, on the other hand, that neither by Moses, nor anywhere else in the Bible, is it ever *said* that *they were*. The Bishop quotes Genesis xlvi. 12, and says that "it appears to him certain that the writer here means to say that Hezron and Hamul were *born in the land of Canaan* (page 17). Why *certain*, when the sacred writer never says so? Again, he quotes Genesis xlvi. verses 8, 26, 27; also Exodus i. 1 and 5, also Deuteronomy x. 22; and says that "the statement that Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan is vouched positively in these passages." (page 19.) Yet in *none* of these passages is anything of the kind affirmed. We find that this is only an *inference* of the Bishop, because these passages "sum up the 'seventy souls.'" But why is such strong language as "certain," and "vouched so positively," used for a mere inference? This is not the language of severe mathematics, and yet the

Bishop exacts from the sacred writer a far greater severity, and for want of it declares him "incredible and impossible."

But does the statement of Moses amount to this: namely, that Hezron and Hamul went down into Egypt in company with Jacob? If so, they were born in Canaan, as the Bishop infers, and were born when their father could not be more than three or four years old. And this is clearly incredible. Bishop COLENSO, however, affirms that the statement of Moses *does* amount to this. He says, "I assume, then, that it is absolutely undeniable that the narrative of the Exodus (Ex. i. 5.) distinctly involves the statement that the sixty-six persons," (Hezron and Hamul being two of the sixty-six) "out of the loins of Jacob, mentioned in Genesis xlvi. and no others, went down with him" (*i.e.*, in his company, or at the same time,) "into Egypt." (page 18.) However "undeniable" this assumption may be, we must take the liberty to deny it altogether. All we can grant is, that to a person reading Genesis xlvi. for the first time, or without due attention, *it might seem* that Hezron and Hamul went down with Jacob. Our counter proposition to the Bishop's is this:

The Mosaic account *does not* involve the statement that Hezron and Hamul went down, *in point of time*, with Jacob.

We will now attempt to prove this. The expression "*with Jacob*," in Genesis xlvi. 26, means *in Jacob's lifetime*. We maintain this from verse 8. There it is said, "These are the names of the children of Israel, which *came into Egypt*." The "came with Jacob into Egypt," of verse 26, is *qualified* by the "came into Egypt" of verse 8; and what can the qualification be conceived to be, but as to time? The sacred writer is guarding himself against the misconception that might arise from verse 26, that all the "threescore and six" went down absolutely, as to time, with Jacob. And that he *does* mean by "with Jacob," in Jacob's lifetime, appears, we think, beyond all doubt from verse 27; there we read, "all the souls of the house of Jacob, which *came into Egypt* were three-score and ten." Now two of these seventy, Ephraim and Manasseh, he tells us in this very verse were born in

Egypt; how then can the words, "came into Egypt" as applied to them, possibly mean anything else but that *they were there in Jacob's lifetime?* The same meaning is the only possible one in Exodus i. 1, (the text so much relied on by the Bishop) of the words "came with Jacob." For there too, is the qualifying expression "came into Egypt;" and there, too, the historian reckons up those who so came at "seventy souls," (verse 5,) one of whom, Joseph, certainly never came there with Jacob in any other sense but coming in his lifetime, as the sacred historian expressly adds, "for Joseph was in Egypt already."

So far then is Moses from affirming positively that all the sixty-six went down into Egypt at the same time, that he expressly guards against such misconception of his statement, by showing that his meaning is that they all went down in Jacob's lifetime. In this sense, and in this sense only, can Joseph be one of the seventy who went down with Jacob, for Moses carefully tells us he went before. In this sense only, could Ephraim and Manasseh be two of the seventy, for he carefully tells us that they were born in Egypt. Unless then it can be shown that Hezron and Hamul could not have been born in Jacob's life-time, the whole of the Bishop's objection must fall to the ground. But they certainly *could* have been born in Jacob's life-time, "for Jacob lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years" (Genesis xlvii. 28): and by that time their father Pharez would be twenty or twenty-one.

In brief, the statement of Moses, we contend, is clearly this: Hezron and Hamul were *not* born in Canaan, did *not* go down to Egypt at the time of Jacob's emigration, but were born in Egypt during Jacob's life-time.

The objection seems to have arisen because the Bishop will insist that the words "with Jacob," mean *at the same time*, whereas we contend the sacred writer carefully shows us that they mean *in Jacob's life-time.* Will the Bishop maintain that those two words must mean that they all came at the very same instant of time? This is a more than mathematic precision which even he would hardly exact. We

have *historic* precision, and that is all we want or ought to look for. Take an illustration. Suppose an historian of England were to say of a certain household of seventy souls, that it came into England with William the Conqueror. Suppose him to qualify this expression by saying and repeating elsewhere that it came into England. Suppose him farther to say that one of the seventy came into England *before* William. Suppose him still farther to say that two more of the seventy were *born*, not came, into England. And suppose him, still in *his own history*, to make the age of two more, such that they *could* have been born in England in the Conqueror's lifetime, and *must* have been so born. Would any ordinary reader say that his statement that the household came into England with William the Conqueror was *historically untrue?* Should we not reply, "You are treating the history not as a history, but as an arithmetic?" Now if the reader in the above illustration will substitute Jacob for William the Conqueror, and Egypt for England, he will have the Mosaic account of Jacob's emigration, and will see the weight of Bishop Colenso's objection.

OBJECTION III.

THE SIZE OF THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE, COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF THE CONGREGATION.

The objection is founded on the following words, in Leviticus viii. 1, 3, 4: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying . . . Gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation. And Moses did as the Lord commanded him; and the assembly was gathered together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation."

The objection is this: That the assembly, to be gathered unto the door of the Tabernacle, must have come *within the court* of it. But this court, the Bishop demonstrates, would hold no more than five thousand, whereas about a quarter of the whole population was (in round numbers) six hundred thousand.

ANSWER.

The whole question turns on the *meaning* attached to the expressions "the assembly," "the whole assembly," "all the congregation;" The Bishop says, "It appears to be certain (!) that by these expressions is meant the whole body of the people, at all events, *the adult males in the prime of life* among them." (page 31.) We will now take the passages adduced by the Bishop himself in favour of this opinion, and endeavour fairly to draw out their meaning by a seriatim examination.

(1.) Lev. viii. 3, 4. Here Moses was ordered to gather "*all the congregation*;" but it was "*the assembly*" only *was* gathered. We infer from two phrases being used there was some understood distinction between them. And the distinction we infer to be this, that the latter was *a part* of the former.

(2.) Exodus xii. 6. "The whole assembly of the congregation shall kill it (the Paschal Lamb) in the evening." The Bishop's first meaning cannot be right for this, unless babes and infants killed or helped kill the lamb. Neither is his second meaning probable according to his own figures; for he estimates 150,000 as the number of lambs required, and this involves four men in the killing of each lamb. We infer the meaning of the expression to be *general*, *i. e.*, no part of the population exempt from the command.

(3.) Exodus xvi. 2. "The whole congregation of the children of Israel murmured," &c. This excludes infants, for they could not have "murmured." We think that the meaning may fairly be inferred to be the people generally, *i.e.*, in great numbers, murmured; and we will admit that

the expression, "the whole assembly," in the next verse, *does* apply to all, man, woman, and child.

(4.) Numbers xiv. 5. "All the assembly of the congregation," &c. We infer the meaning to be, all of the congregation that were assembled. (Sept. πασης συναγωγης; all the meeting. Vulg. *omni multitudine*; all the multitude.)

(5.) Numbers i. 18. The meaning of "all the congregation" here, is clearly confined to the warriors of twenty years old, and upward.

(6.) Leviticus xxiv. 14 and Numbers xv. 36. "All the congregation" in these two passages must be limited by (3.)

(7.) Numbers xvi. 19, 25. "All the congregation" gathered by Korah, is limited by ver. 16 to a very small number, 250 (ver. 17), *viz.*, Korah's own company. Compare also verses 21 and 22. The rest of the congregation was not with them, for they were "in the door of the Tabernacle" (ver. 18); while the rest were about "the tabernacle of Korah," &c. (ver. 24); and "*on every side*" of it. (ver. 27).

(8.) Numbers x. 3, 4. Here we think "all the assembly" does not mean the whole population, but only a fraction of them. For the trumpets were used to call the assembly "when the tents were to be moved," or raised. (Vulg. and Sept.) Numbers of the people must have been employed in raising their tents. We presume the words, "all the assembly shall assemble ... at the door," &c., to refer to those not thus employed. We read the words, too, as an order as to what they *were to do*, not as stating the fact of *what they did*. We admit, however, that this interpretation is not so necessary as the former ones appear to be, and we will therefore grant, (for argument's sake only,) the expression *does* mean here the great mass of the population, though it can hardly be supposed to mean, young children and those taking care of them.

(9.) Joshua viii. 35. The addition of the words, "with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers," &c., to the expression "all the congregation," seems to restrict this expression to adult males.

We will now give the results of the above analysis. If it be a fair and correct one, we establish this. The "assembly," in Lev. viii. 4, does not mean the same as "all the congregation" in verse 3, but means a part of it. That the phrases "whole assembly of the congregation" and "whole congregation of the children of Israel," are necessarily restricted by (2) and (3) to a part of the whole people. That the phrase "whole assembly" does in one case (3) apply to *all*, and may so apply in (8). Lastly, what is the important point of our argument, that in one case (7), the expression "all the congregation" is limited in (7) to a *very small fraction indeed* of the whole population, *viz.*, only *two hundred and fifty*.

We will now apply these results. In the passage on which the Bishop founds his objection (Leviticus viii. 1-4), it is, we repeat, "all the congregation" who are summoned, but it is "the assembly" who come. Now if "all the congregation" means a part of the whole population, and once so small a part as two hundred and fifty, the "assembly" must mean a still smaller part by (1). (The word "assembly" in the Sept., we may remark in passing, means no more than what we call "a meeting," συναγωγη*). We maintain therefore, that not the *main body;* (Colenso, p. 33) not the 600,000 (round numbers) actually gathered "unto the door of the Tabernacle," but a very much smaller number, and perhaps a very small number indeed.

But, says the Bishop, they *ought* (p. 33) to have been there. This is very true. But we demur to the conclusion that because 600,000 *ought* to have been there, therefore they *were* there. For *ought*, as in matters of arithmetic it stands for nothing, so in matters of duty it often stands for next to nothing. Thus the writer has known the church bell call "all the congregation" of five thousand together, when "the assembly" actually gathered was no more than three or four.

* Taking the word συναγωγη in the Sept., and the words "*multitudo, turba, cœtus, congregatio, congregaverunt,*" in the Vulg., we may fairly take all the expressions, "assembly," &c., to mean what in common phrase is called "a large meeting."

Moreover, the Bishop should recollect that the children of Israel were a "stiff-necked" and "disobedient" people. Neither do we think it fair that the "assembly" should be assumed to be gathered in measured, mathematical lines, equal in length either to the breadth of the tabernacle or of its door. We may more fairly, we think, believe that the expression, "unto the door," means that the door was the *point d'appui*, if we may be allowed the term, the spot unto which they were to flock together.

In fine, we maintain that "the assembly" really gathered unto the door, might be far less than the five thousand which it would hold, and that this is shown by a careful consideration of the words of Moses himself.

OBJECTION IV.

MOSES AND JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL.

This objection is founded on Deut. i. 1; Deut. v. 1; and Joshua viii. 34, 35; and is as follows:—That the people being two millions and a half (round numbers) it "is not conceivable that a man should do what" (Moses and) "Joshua are there said to have done" (*i.e.*, speak and read to them all) "unless it were done in dumb show." (page 36, 37.)

ANSWER.

It must be admitted that Moses and Joshua could not have spoken and read to all Israel, so as to be heard by them, without a miracle. And of such a miracle, as the Bishop justly adds, "scripture tells us nothing." (page 37.) But it does not follow because no miracle was recorded, none was wrought; because there are many circumstances in the

Pentateuch, clearly miraculous, where the miracle itself is not related. In fact, the Exodus and wanderings of Israel from first to last are altogether miraculous.

But we make no use of this argument *here*. We think the whole objection is met by applying here, the rule of *qui facit per alium, facit per se*. If Moses and Joshua gave orders such that their words were spoken and read to all Israel, then they in effect, spoke and read them themselves to all Israel. This, we think, is a fair and natural construction to put upon the words of the sacred writer. Certainly, it *is* the construction often put upon secular history. Thus, *ex. gr.*, we read sometimes of a General, in the course of a battle, "bringing up fresh troops into action," where the "bringing" means that they were brought by his orders, but the actual setting them in motion, he has had nothing to do with. Let us interpret the words of divine history with no more favour and no less than we give to profane, and there is nothing in the statements objected to but what is *historically true*.

OBJECTION V.

THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP, COMPARED WITH THE PRIEST'S DUTIES AND THE DAILY NECESSITIES OF THE PEOPLE.

The nature of the objection is this, that the camp of the Israelites must have been of such wide extent that the people could not have travelled the distances required of them. (Colenso, pp. 39, 40.) We will not enter into the details of this objection, as we shall follow them in our

ANSWER.

We admit the computation of the Bishop to be reasonable, viz.: that the area of the whole camp covered a space of *twelve square miles.* But we are entitled to *surmise* that this whole camp, of so great extent, and containing such hosts, must have had *sub-divisions.* Probability makes this a natural order, a necessary surmise. We turn then to scripture, to Moses' scripture, to see if this surmise be confirmed or rejected. And we find that it is no *surmise* at all, but a recorded *fact.* Thus Moses tells us the Gershonites "pitched westward the tabernacle." (Numbers iii. 23.) "Moses and Aaron and his sons, encamped towards the east." (Numbers iii. 38.) "The camp of Judah pitched eastward the tabernacle." (Numbers ii. 3.) Each tribe had its separate encampment. (Numbers ii. whole chapter.) Each camp had its own "standard" (Numbers ii. 34.), and its own "captain." (Numbers x. 14—27.) The children of Israel were ordered "to pitch their tents every man by his own camp" and every man by his own "standard." (Numbers i. 52.) In short, let the reader only run his eye over the above-quoted passages, and he will find it *impossible* to come to any other conclusion but that *the whole camp* was divided into twelve compartments or sub-divisions.

Such being the *fact*, the Bishop's objections, (pages 39, 40,) become, in mathematic phrase, "vanishing quantities." The Priests would *not* have far to carry the offal. The people would *not* have far to carry their "ashes," and "rubbish," and "filth of every kind." They would *not* have far to go for "necessities of nature." And as to the command in this last respect contained in Deut. xxiii. 12-14, we cannot see why the Bishop should suppose it to include those who could not obey it, *viz.*, "the aged and infirm, women in childbirth, sick persons, and young children." Thus instead of going "*six miles*" (Colenso, p. 40) they would have only to go the very short distance to the outside of their own camp.

OBJECTION VI.

THE NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE AT THE FIRST MUSTER, COMPARED WITH THE POLL-TAX RAISED SIX MONTHS PREVIOUSLY.

Before entering upon this objection, we will just notice a preliminary one, though we must candidly avow our opinion that it does not need notice. The Bishop objects that the expression "shekel of the sanctuary" in Exodus xxx. 13, could hardly have been used in the way it is, "until the sanctuary had been *some time* in existence, and such a phrase had become *familiar* in the mouths of the people." (Colenso, p. 41.) Yet, he adds, "here it is put into the mouth of Jehovah, six or seven months before the tabernacle was made." And, "the phrase is used again," he says, "in Exodus xxxviii. 24, 25, 26, of the actual contributions of the people *towards the building of the sanctuary*."

Now, since Moses wrote the book of Exodus *after* the building of the sanctuary, may we not look upon the expression "half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary," as an explanatory note, *nota bene*, or parenthesis, declarative of the value of the half shekel? There is just such an explanatory parenthesis in the English version, in the same verse with the above words and immediately after. Or, if the expression *must* be understood as the words of Jehovah himself to Moses, where, we ask, is the "difficulty"? We feel a repugnance for reverence' sake to make any comparison between the words of Almighty God and the words of man. But since the objection obliges us to do so, we offer this illustration. As it *may* have pleased the Almighty to explain to his servant what "a shekel of the sanctuary" was, before the phrase *was* familiar to the people, and before the sanctuary was in existence; so it certainly *did* please the government to tell us what a *florin* was, before the phrase was familiar to the people, and before the florin was in existence.

We pass on now to consider the objection as to the poll-tax compared with the census.

It is founded on a comparison between Exodus xxxviii. 26, and Numbers i. 46, in each of which passages, the number of adult males is given as the same, (603,550) though the census of Numbers was taken more than six months after the poll-tax of Exodus. Stated in the Bishop's own words, the objection is this: That "it is surprising that the number of adult males should have been *identically the same* (603,550) *on the first occasion, as it was half-a-year afterwards.*" (Colenso, p. 42.)

The following is offered as an

ANSWER.

In Exodus xxxviii. we have, as Kurtz says, "simply the raising of a tax, and no numbering at all." Yet, it must be granted that verses 25 and 26, of Exodus xxxviii. in the English version, do imply a numbering, and that the number of adults was deduced from the number of half shekels. But these verses are not found in the Vulgate. There, after verse 24, which gives the offerings of *gold* (not silver), it is written, "It was offered (*i. e.* the gold), by those who went over to be numbered of twenty years old and upward, for 603,550 armed men." And, though the Vulgate *does* afterwards give the amount of *silver* used on the sanctuary, verses 27, 28, yet it *does not* give them in such manner as that the number of people was reckoned from the number of half shekels.

There are then Hebrew manuscripts which do not deduce the number of adult males (603,550), from the amount of silver. We therefore conclude with Kurtz, that this was the "raising of a tax, and no numbering at all." The *second* census of Numbers i. was however a very strict numbering. As Kurtz says, "it was commanded, organized and carried out with solemnity and formality; and, as Kurtz adds, "the difference in number of population, would be very trifling in the space of six or seven months,"—we think the sacred writer gives the more correct result of the census of Numbers i., in his account of the poll-tax in Exodus xxxviii. 26.

And this course, an exact writer would be careful to pursue. With regard to the Bishop's replies to Kurtz (p. 43) on this point, if the view of "the poll-tax no numbering" be true, then his argument I. fails: also II. and III. fail, from the Vulgate version above given. Of II. we add, that we do not say the amount of silver is less accurate than that of the gold or the brass, but only the number of men given was not derived from the amount; and IV., which is a deduction from I., II., III., must be entirely reversed, and read thus: "the story in Exodus *is* a rough estimate," as Kurtz supposes.

Next—with regard to the round numbers in Numbers i. The Bishop objects that they are all in *round hundreds* except the tribe of Gad, which ends in a fifty. But Numbers i. 3, tells us that this census was a *military* census. The divine command was, "Thou and Aaron shall number them *by their armies;*" "by their *troops*," (*turmas*) it is in the Vulgate. Being thus reckoned by their armies or troops, there is nothing very surprising that they should be given to the nearest hundred. And if one tribe (Gad) out of twelve should have happened to have come up exactly to a fifty, it is not a *very* extraordinary chance. It is about the same chance, that if the numbers one to eight were put in a bag, a person at the first draw should take out any particular one, say eight. It *may* then, without supposing anything more wonderful than what often occurs, be supposed that the tribe of Gad came up to an exact fifty, and for that reason was so set down. With regard to the Bishop's argument that *every individual* paid "a ransom for his soul" (Exodus xxx. 12) at each numbering (p. 44), we answer that, this being done, does not hinder Moses who was numbering them by troops, giving their numbers as troops. As to the numbering in Numbers xxvi., we confess we can see no reason why eleven tribes should be reckoned in round numbers, and the twelfth (Reuben) in an odd thirty. But we can easily conceive that the reason was known and understood at the time. But whether known or not, we contend there is nothing wonderful or surprising in the circumstance, and that it in no way affects the *historic truthfulness* of the writer.

OBJECTION VII.

THE ISRAELITES DWELLING IN TENTS.

The objection is founded upon this text, "Take ye every man for them which are in his tents." (Exodus xvi. 16.) Whereupon the Bishop truly observes, that "immediately after their coming out of Egypt, the people had *tents*" (Colenso, p. 45). And he then attempts to prove that the *weight* of these tents must have been so great as to require 200,000 oxen to carry them (p. 47). How much reason there is for making the *weight* so excessive, will be seen in the following

ANSWER.

The Bishop assumes that the Israelites had tents, when they left Egypt, "with poles, pegs, &c.," such as the luxury of modern travel employs; or rather he assumes the Hebrew tents to have been "much heavier" (p. 47). We will now make a counter assumption, giving the fact which we think makes it a highly probable one. The fact is this. In the present day, in Syria and Palestine, we see at the four corners of the flat roofs of houses, four sticks set upright. To the tops of these four sticks are fastened the four corners of a piece of matting, which thus spreads as an awning over the roof. The writer has taken meals under such a *tent* many times; and many nights in his clothes or wrapped in a grego, slept. This would protect the Israelites "from the sun by day, and the moon" (or dew) "by night." (Psalm cxxi. 6.) We think it then *highly probable* that this was their tent in the flight. It would be sufficient protection in a country where rain seldom comes, and then only for a short time. At all events, it would be all they could want for a short time; and the fact of such tents being used *now*, is a strong presumption, considering the unchangeableness of Eastern habits, that they were used *then*. Now four such sticks and

a matting, under which ten *men* might sleep side by side, and sit at their meals, would not, the writer thinks, be so much as *five* pounds weight at the utmost. Now, taking the whole population at two millions and a half, we may fairly assume that they would not take up more space than two million *men*. Take a ten-man tent at five pounds, and an able-bodied man may be allowed to march under the burden of ten such tents, especially in a case of urgency. This would employ twenty thousand men, or one man in thirty of able bodies.

N.B. We have assigned the burden to men rather than oxen, both as more probable, and because we object to the small weight of one hundred and sixty pounds to an ox on march, assigned by the Bishop, when we have seen a no very great Hercules carry two hundred weight a short distance.

If, after the overthrow of the Egyptians, when the people had more leisure, they attached a back and two side pieces, and partially covered the front, there would be a *tent* with "a door," as afterwards described in Exodus xxxiii. 8, 10.

As to "decency" (Colenso, p. 46), where all laid down to rest in their garments, the women might have lain as Ruth at the feet of Boaz; or the men and women might have several tents; or the men might do without tents, which would further reduce them nearly one half.

OBJECTION VIII.

THE ISRAELITES ARMED.

The objection is founded on this text: "The children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt." Exodus xiii. 18.

And it is in substance this,—

(1.) "That it is inconceivable the Israelites could have possessed arms at the time of their flight" (Colenso, p. 48);

and (2) "if they were armed that they should have been so debased and inhuman in their cowardice, as not to fight the pursuing Egyptians in defence of their wives and children." (Colenzo, p. 51.)

ANSWER.

1. As to their being armed. Here it must be observed, in the first place, that the word חמשים "harnessed," does not *certainly* mean armed, nor *necessarily* imply it. *Gesenius in hoc loco* interprets it "eager," "active," "brave," "ready," "prepared for fighting;" only the last of these meanings implies having arms. Let us endeavour to fix the meaning of the word, for "harnessed" conveys no distinct idea, and so the English translators appear to have thought, by putting "by five in a rank" in the margin. Now when we find a word of obscure meaning in a dead language, the proper course is to search for other passages where the same word occurs, (and especially in the same writer,) and give it such meaning, if we can, as will suit these other passages. Acting thus in the present case, we contend that "in battle array," is a suitable meaning, as Kurtz says, for it fits *all* the passages cited by Bishop Colenso. But we do not agree with Kurtz that this meaning "certainly includes the notion of being armed." It surely *need not* in all cases, and that of the Israelites was a very peculiar and exceptional case: and if these considerations be allowed, then all that the sacred writer says, is, that they went out of Egypt in battle array, *i.e.*, *in regular order*, as Scott has it, and not a disorderly rabble.

Grant, however, that the word *does* mean armed. We do not think it "inconceivable" that they should have been armed; not indeed every individual man, but *generally*, *i.e.*, in large numbers. But how armed? Certainly not with the "swords, spears, and shields" of the Bishop's imagination. How were Monmouth's rustics armed, if Macaulay be not "incredible and impossible?" They had, he says, "no

other weapons than such as could be made out of the tools which they had used in husbandry and mining. Of these rude implements of war the most formidable was made by fastening the blade of a scythe erect on a strong pole." (Macaulay, vol. i., page 587-88.) And why not the children of Israel their "tools of husbandry" too? An ox-goad for a spear, a plough-share for a sword, and perhaps a large hammer for a battle-axe?

2. How was it they were so "cowardly" when pursued by the Egyptians? (Colenso, page 51, on Exodus xiv. 12.) Why, for many and good reasons. Because Egypt's hosts, as Herodotus tells us, and as the Bishop quotes him, were a disciplined army, "who applied themselves wholly to military affairs." Because Pharoah had his "horsemen and chariots" (Exodus xiv. 9), and could therefore kill them at a distance, could drive and ride round, at, and over them. Because they were cumbered with burdens, and with their women and children. Because they were much as a mob, charged by foot and horse soldiery; as sheep in a pen before the dog and the butcher. And because "the thicker such grass the easier it is mown."

OBJECTION IX.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER.

This objection is founded on Exodus xii. 21—28.

We cannot very well *state* this objection, because, under the above heading the Bishop takes notice of several other matters. We will therefore try to follow his arguments of chapter x. in our

ANSWER.

The objection begins thus: "*In one single day*, the whole immense population, as large as that of London, was instructed to keep the Passover, and actually did keep it." "I

have said in one single day," continues Bishop C., "for the first notice of any such feast to be kept, is given in this very chapter, where we find it written (Exodus xii. 12), "I will pass through the land of Egypt *this night*, and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast;" and then he argues, "It cannot be said that they had notice several days before-hand." We would follow this argument if we could. But down to the bottom of the page (54), we cannot understand it; and although the Bishop does not appear to allow any errors or omissions of transcription in the Pentateuch, yet we cannot but think there is something of the kind as to the pronouns "this" and "that" in *this* part of his work on it. We will therefore give our own proposition and try to prove it, and it is:—

That they *had* notice several days before-hand. In Exodus xii. 3, the command is given, "In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb." In verse 6, "Ye shall *keep it up* until the *fourteenth* day of the same month." After this follow the directions as to the manner of preparing and eating it; and then, in verse 12, is given the reason for the institution, "For I will pass through the land of Egypt THAT night."* All this is spoken *before* the *tenth* day. Thus the lamb *was* "taken and kept up," ready to be killed, and all the directions given as to eating it *four days in advance.* All being thus ready, on the fourteenth Moses gives the word for celebration—"Draw out (the lamb) and kill the passover." If the reader will only read over attentively Exodus xii. to verse 22, we are convinced he can come to no other conclusion.

But, the Bishop says, that when, in Exodus xi. 4, "Moses

* The writer believes "THAT" to be the true reading here, and not "THIS" as in the E.V. For though it is the pronoun הַזֹּה in Van der Hooght, yet it is certainly "THAT" in the Sept. and Vulgate versions, for in both it is a word in opposition to the word *this* in verse 14. Thus the Sept. in verse 12, has *νυκτὶ ταύτῃ* "*that* night" in opposition to *ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη this*, or *this same* day, in verse 14. So the Vulgate, verse 12, has "nocte illa," *that* night, in opposition to "hunc diem," *this* day, in verse 14. There are therefore good and strong reasons for asserting that all Exodus xii. down to the end of verse 20, was spoken *before* the *tenth* day of the month.

said, Thus saith the Lord, *About midnight* will I go," &c., there can be "no doubt that the midnight then next at hand is intended." We really think on the contrary, that there *is*, and very great, doubt. For the expression, "about midnight" is a *general* expression, meaning any midnight. It fixes the *time*, but not the *day*, not the particular midnight. And there is nothing in Exodus xi. that makes against this, but rather the contrary.

The Israelites were thus prepared in all points, to kill and eat the Passover at once, when the signal was given. The "*sign*" (Colenso, p. 55) *could*, we say, be given to all in *twelve hours* (*Ibid*), even though they be supposed to be spread over a district "larger than Hertfordshire." (Colenso, p. 59.) Whoever knows how expert Easterns are with signals, will have no difficulty in believing that the "sign" passed so rapidly; especially on so momentous an occasion, and among men in the attitude of eager expectation. And here we will take leave of the institution of the Passover.

Next. The Bishop complains of "the borrowing," recorded in Exodus iii. 22, as incredible.

In the first place we remark, that it is by no means *certain* from the sacred story that the Israelites, "when suddenly summoned to depart, hastened, at a moment's* notice, to 'borrow' in all directions from the Egyptians." (Colenso, p. 56.) On the contrary, we think it quite as likely, from the narrative, that the borrowing took place *before* the day of flight. The borrowing was, as we shall presently see, a before-settled arrangement; and the sacred historian does not fix the exact time it took place. All that he says is, "The children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels," &c., (Exodus xii. 35), and these words leave it quite an open question whether they borrowed *before*, or *at*, the time of flight.

Grant, however, that the "borrowing" *did* take place on

* The use of the word "moment" here, and at page 61, is a huge departure from that mathematical severity of expression which the Bishop exacts of the Pentateuch.

the night of departure. And, we ask, where is the difficulty still? None—when we call to mind that there was (1) Preparation; and (2) miraculous interference. There was preparation, for, before one of the plagues was wrought, when God appeared to Moses in the bush, he gave him the order to borrow, and detailed both who should borrow and what should be borrowed (Exodus iii. 22). Before the tenth day of the month, the flight being on the fourteenth, the order is repeated to Moses, and he is told then to declare it to the Israelites. "Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbour," &c. (Exodus xi. 2.)

2. There was miraculous interference. God himself promised his help in the matter, when he appeared to Moses in the bush. "I will give this people *favour* in the sight of the Egyptians: and it shall come to pass, that, when ye go, *ye shall not go empty* (Exodus iii. 21). Before the tenth of the month, this divine help was given. "The Lord *gave* the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians." (Exodus xi. 3). (From these words we incline to think the borrowing was made then.) And now, still supposing the borrowing to be on the night of departure, the Israelites had before it, made their requests, and the Egyptians had been, by divine grace, disposed to comply with them; nay, were more than disposed to comply, were most anxious to press the things needed upon them. For as we read that they "were *urgent* upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste" (Ex. xii. 33); we may reasonably believe they thrust on them the means of so doing. Taking all this into account, and also that the things borrowed, were light and of small compass, "jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment" (Exodus iii. 22, and xi. 2, and xii. 35); and where is the "difficulty?"

Last. The Bishop thinks the *start*, or rather the warning to start, out of Egypt was too sudden. "How," he asks, "could the secured notice to start, have been so suddenly and so completely circulated; for not one, he says, "was to go out at the door of his house until the morning?" (Exodus

xii. 22.) We will try and tell him how, for it appears very simple. In the first place, we think that this order though a *general* one, had its exceptions, and if Moses wanted messengers to carry out God's commands, such exceptions would have been allowed. Such exceeding severity of interpretation as the Bishop's is we think unnecessary, especially when we remember that Moses records *great* events, but does not jot down *little* details.* But be it that the law had no exception. It is "inconceivable" that Moses should have had no friends among the Egyptians ready to obey his behests, especially since they were most anxious to get rid of the Hebrews (Exodus x. 7). And then—that "mixed multitude" (Exodus xii. 38) that "went up with them;" (the order certainly had nothing to do with them)—what were they about all day? Surely Moses might find plenty of messengers from among *them.* What more likely than that he did so? They could easily bring in the people to Rameses and its suburbs, even from "a district larger than Hertfordshire." But why should Moses be required to set down all these petty details, or indeed why should *we?*

OBJECTION X.

THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT.

The objection is founded on Exodus xii. 37, 38. It is chiefly this: That the whole population of the Israelites, two millions and a half (say), "were summoned to start, and actually started, at a moment's notice,* not one being left behind, together with all their multitudinous flocks and herds." (Colenso, p. 61.) We cannot, however, for briefness' sake, put the whole of this objection into one statement.

* See Note, page 23.

We therefore refer the reader to Colenso, chapter xi.; still he will find them embodied in our

ANSWER.

The suddenness of the summons we have already discussed in the last objection. It was there shown the "warning" was not "at a moment's notice," but at a twelve-hours' one. It was also shown, how they might have easily been collected into Rameses and its suburbs to eat the passover, and were thus all at hand for the start. But we do not insist on this last circumstance, as being *certain*, but only as *probable*, or, suppose we say, *possible*. Be this as the reader pleases, still the Bishop will not allow, under any circumstances, the suddenness of the Israelites' start, as put in the statement above. All that he has objected to before is bad enough, but this is far worse—"it is," he says, "utterly incredible and impossible."

We think not, however. If the people were collected in Rameses and its suburbs—if, as is most certain—they were as ready and eager for the spring as a hare when the greyhounds are unslipped—why then, that they should start the next morning, is not beyond the bounds of possibility, even though no other than natural means were employed. The herdsmen and shepherds, scattered over Goshen, that unfortunate "district larger than Hertfordshire," might have moved up nearer to the rallying point of Rameses in the after-midnight, and joined the main body further on, with their flocks and their herds.

This, however, is not the true solution of the wonders of the flight. It is only offered as a consideration to those who would place it out of the bounds of possibility. The true, the *scripture*, solution is that—

There *was* miraculous interference. We have hitherto assumed nothing but natural means, no miraculous interference. But as we shall have a little word to say about such assumption under the next objection, we will say no more

about it here. We will therefore repeat that there *was* miraculous interference here. Moses tells us that the whole Exodus was determined, ordered, and wrought out, by Almighty God himself. David expressly mentions one miracle, "there was not one feeble person among their tribes." (Ps. cv. 37.) If this be not a miracle among tribes numbering two millions and a half, we cannot conceive what is. But the Psalmist tells us still more, viz., that the flight itself was miraculous, "He," *i.e.*, God, "He *brought them forth* with silver and gold;" (*ib.*) Why then are "sick and infirm," brought forward as objections in the teeth of the Psalmist? seeing he tells us there were none. Must he too fall into the Mosaic category of "incredible and impossible?"

The above considerations, we think, coupled with what has been stated as to the means previously employed, is a sufficient answer to Colenso, pages 61, 62. It is much the same as that of Kurtz, quoted by the Bishop (pages 62, 63), though we do not agree with him as to the *impossibility* of all, at all events of the great mass of the people, meeting at Rameses next morning, and for the reasons already given.

Now how does the Bishop reply to Kurtz? Kurtz says, "the procession started from Rameses, and smaller parties joined it from all directions." "Oh, but," says the Bishop, "that idea will never do; the text before us says plainly, "the children of Israel journeyed from *Rameses to Succoth*, about six hundred thousand on foot.'" (Colenso, page 63.) And so, because Moses says they started from *Rameses*, he will not allow a single man to come in from the neighbourhood. We ask, is it fair to treat any historian, sacred or profane, thus? If Rameses were the head quarters for the setting-out, as undoubtedly it was, for there was King Pharaoh, and there were Moses and Aaron; if the great bulk of people did start from thence, is it to be said he is "incredible," or even "historically untrue," because, by Rameses he includes the country surrounding it? Certainly the Bishop himself is not so inexorably exact of speech in

his own history, for he tells us the population of London is 2,803,035 (page 36), by which he means to include Westminster, and half-a-dozen other large towns as well. Would it be fair to charge him for this, with being historically untrue? Certainly not. But the Pentateuch, in his sight, is a "Treatise on Arithmetic," rather than an "Outline of Jewish History." In fact, here, as elsewhere, the Bishop treats Moses just as the grave-digger does Hamlet,—"an' he speak not by the book, (of Arithmetic) equivocation shall undo him."

As we have rather complained here and often of the Bishop's *canon of criticism*, it is only fair to state what that canon is, and *why* we complain of it. The canon may fairly be stated to be this: "The application of arithmetic to history"—a method far different "from the application of algebra to geometry." According to this canon, every sentence, nay every word (Rameses to wit), of an historian, is to be understood with a more than mathematical precision; and we say that such a canon, whether applied to sacred or profane history, is *wholly inadmissible*. It is wholly inadmissible, because no history at all could stand such a test. All history must be abandoned at once as "incredible and impossible." We must give up the Asiatic invasion of Greece, the battles of Marathon and of Salamis, because Greek historians *really are* preposterous, both in their figures and facts.* The battle of Waterloo is altogether a fable, because Alison and M. Thiers are not harmonious in their numbers. Even mathematics must be abandoned as a delusion. An algebraist who tells us that $\frac{a}{o}$ equals infinity, or who has the audacity to sum up an infinite series, is a violent romancer. The books of Euclid must go, too, with those of the Pentateuch. For Euclid all along, assumes, for the base of his history, the reality of a straight line, and Euclid is therefore a most abominable impostor. (What a comfort for school boys at the Pons Asinorum!) Nay, speech itself must fall into the same category of condemnation. For a man can hardly utter a

* "quidquid Græcia mendax
"Audet in historia." *Juv. Sat.* x. 174.

sentence, or relate a circumstance without being picked up at once, as *historically untrue;* and language is given not only to "disguise" but to belie our thoughts. Surely no critic can be allowed to go *figuring* like this!

But to return to the Flight. It is objected that the first three days' march is long and severe. Poor Kurtz spies out this, and meekly pleads that, perhaps, they had some rest on the way. But the Bishop is stern and inexorable still. He must have his "pound of flesh," from that unhappy culprit whom he has dragged forth for execution. "It is not in the bond." "Nothing whatever," says the Bishop, "is said or implied about these days of rest in the Scripture. There would surely have been some reference made to them, if they really occurred." (Colenso, p. 63.) Well no, we confess it is *not* in the bond. But then, it is no very violent or improbable flight of imagination to suppose that they did rest. As to there being no reference made to it, it is surely enough to say, that Moses is writing a Jewish, not an arithmetical, progression. He gives us, as already noted, the chief facts, not the petty details. Thus he does not tell us that they *slept* during those toilsome days of march, from Rameses to the Red Sea. Yet, in spite of our terror of this unrelenting Rhadamanthus, we almost believe that they did. At all events, as the publishers say, "the right of believing this idea is reserved."

We hasten to the last objection on this point. "And now let us see them on the march itself." (Colenso, p. 63.) So we will; first with the Bishop's, and then with our own eyes. The Bishop sees them "in one column, fifty men abreast," (p. 63) "extending more than *twenty-two miles long*" (ibid),—a line of continuous motion, compared to which, the tail of the great sea serpent is a mere trifle itself—"with its head two days' march in advance of the rear." (Colenso, pp. 63, 64.) Why the Bishop should see them thus, we cannot imagine. They are not so marshalled in the book of Exodus. We see them rather in a good many columns, and covering a great *breadth* as well as length of ground. In fact we see them

taking ground more in breadth than in length. But the reader is requested to see with his own eyes.

"And the sheep and the cattle" says the Bishop, "they must have formed another vast column." (p. 64.) Yes, no doubt. "But what did these two millions of sheep and oxen live upon during this journey from Rameses to Succoth, and from Succoth to Etham, and from Etham to the Red Sea?" (Colenso, p. 64.) We suspect that they lived upon very short rations indeed, both the cattle and the people, during these three days. We have a little to say upon this matter too, but as it belongs to the subject following, it shall be attended to by-and-by, in OBJECTION XI.

OBJECTION XI.

THE SHEEP AND CATTLE OF THE ISRAELITES IN THE DESERT.

The objection is founded on Exodus xvi. 35—"The children of Israel did eat manna for forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan;" and it is this:—

That "there was no miraculous provision of food for the herds and flocks: that they were left to gather sustenance, as they could, in the wilderness: and that it is impossible such a multitude of cattle could find any (!) means of support, for forty years, under the circumstances." (Colenso, p. 65.)

Now the *possibility*, or impossibility, of maintaining these large flocks and herds, in the desert, depends upon the correctness or incorrectness of the Bishop's two premises: (1) That there were no *natural*, and (2) that there were no *super-natural*, means of support. These are the two points to which we must give our attention. In doing so, we shall follow the Bishop's arguments, in this the longest, and (as

we think) the most interesting chapter of his book. And, having thus shaped our course, we will make sail on our

ANSWER.

(1). Investigation of *natural* means of support for flocks and herds, in the desert.

We have, however, almost forgotten that little matter of the victualling of flocks and herds, from Rameses to the Red Sea, mentioned in the preceding objection. We must ask the reader's indulgence, to go back to it for a minute. As there said, we suspect that (allowing no miraculous interference), their rations were very scanty indeed. Still it is not "impossible nor incredible" that, during those three days, well fed for the start, they might have been kept alive by a small quantity of corn providently taken by the herdsmen, and by what little herbage they might pick up on the way. They would not require such high feeding for that short time, as the Bishop seems to suppose, as we shall presently see, and this hypothesis involves only natural means.

But—*revenons à nos moutons*—who are left sadly starving, forty years, in the wilderness. It is high time to find them some means of support.

Now, it must be admitted that the desert itself, is, as the Bishop justly contends, a most unpromising source of supply, even by Mosaic history. The sacred historian constantly describes the barrenness and desolation of that desert, through which God so wonderfully led and preserved his chosen people; and sums it up in fear-inspiring words, as, "a waste howling wilderness." (Deut. xxxii. 10.) How can natural supplies be presumed in the face of this declaration? We must not suppose that "the flocks and herds scattered far and wide" (Colenso, p. 66), in search of food, though the practice is somewhat akin to their instincts, and not altogether unusual. But still, we must *not* suppose this, for here again we are shut up by the Bishop, with a "law of the Medes and Persians." "The story says nothing, and implies nothing

whatever of this" (Colenso, p. 66), and therefore, (though we do feel it rather hard), we say nothing too. We will enquire then, instead, what it is likely that the people could find in, or raise from, such a land. It must be borne in mind that they would want to raise nothing for themselves, since they were "supplied with manna" (Colenso, p. 65), as the Bishop allows. And here we will bring forward Canon Stanley, in evidence (as quoted by Bishop Colenso), to whose valuable work we owe the greatest obligations. Passing by his accurate and eloquent pictures of the grandeur and desolation of the wilderness,—(and the reader will thank us for pointing it out to his notice)—we will take his results. First, he says, "much may be allowed for the spread of the tribes far and wide, through the whole peninsula." (Colenso, p. 70). But this won't do, as we have just seen. "I doubt if any allowance can be made for such spreading," says the Bishop. (p. 70.) We must move on then to result No. 2. The learned Canon mentions the "actual passage through the desert, of a caravan of five thousand African pilgrims on their way to Mecca." (Colenso, p. 71.) But we are promptly driven off this ground again. "The population which we are now considering, was *two millions*, not *five thousand*." (Colenso, p. 71.) Arithmetic obliges, so we humbly go on to result No. 3. Canon Stanley remarks that there "are indications of Sinai having furnished greater resources formerly, than at present." (Colenso, p. 71.) The Bishop answers, "whatever they may be, they cannot do away with the plain language of the Bible already quoted, which shows that the general character of the desert was as desolate and barren then as now." (Colenso, p. 71.) Though "every little helps," and we ask but this small pittance of Mount Sinai, it cannot be granted. There is nothing left but to go mournfully onward to result No. 4. "There is no doubt that the vegetation of the wadys has considerably decreased," says Canon Stanley. (Colenso, p. 71.) There "is no shadow of ground for this belief," and it is'nt worth mentioning, answers our inexorable Bishop. (p. 72.) Not even a few trees, as material for the ark; not a trifle

more water, is permitted. (Colenso, [vii.] and [viii.] p. 72, 73.) In fact, to go no further, the Bishop will not allow the Canon the least gratuity, though the smallest contributions would be thankfully received. Still, we do think that Canon Stanley's deductions are not so completely demolished as all this; and that he certainly does prove that there was, to some little extent, more vegetation formerly than now. And this is all he maintains, and which we think, the Bishop might grant him. He establishes thus much and he demands no more. To use his own able words, "It must be confessed that none of these changes solve the difficulty (*i.e.* of feeding the flocks and herds), though they may *mitigate its force.* But, they at least, help to meet it: and this must, under any circumstances, be borne in mind, to modify the image which we form to ourselves, of what must always have been—as it is even thus early described to be—'a great and terrible wilderness.'" (Colenso, p. 75.)

Well, then, we have made little out of all this, more than that the Bishop dislikes begging. He will not "pity the sorrows of those whose trembling limbs have borne them to his door." And as we confess to have gotten little, whilst we've been upon tramp, we will give up the practice. If begging won't do, we think *work* will, at all events, something very considerable. Canon Stanley shows (and Shaw also) from "the gardens at the wells of Moses, and those of the Greek monks of St. Catharine," how much the diligent hand of man may do, even in the most unthankful soils. (Colenso, p. 73.) There, as elsewhere, God ever blesses His own sacred ordinance of work, and makes even the "desert smile" with herb, and flower, and fruit. "He turneth the wilderness into a standing water, and dry ground into water springs. And *there* he maketh the hungry to dwell, that they may prepare a city for habitation; and sow the fields, and plant vineyards, which may yield fruits of increase." (Psalm cvii. 35–37.) But when Shaw and Canon Stanley show what great things *are* done, the Bishop replies, these are only "little gardens," and made *in a long*

process of time. Surely forty years *is* a long process of time —at least for a gardener! So again, when Canon S. says "there was a greater population then than now," and consequently, with more than half a million adults, the "little gardens" might become great ones; the Bishop quietly begs the whole question at issue. "If the Pentateuch be mainly unhistorical, we can take no account of the power of the Amalekites," that is to say, there *was not* a large population. (Colenso, p. 74.) Because the population is great, the Pentateuch is false; and, because the Pentateuch is false, the population is not great. This is reasoning rather in a circle, we imagine.

On the whole. It is clearly possible and credible, and, we may say, *certain*, that half a million of men, working hard and perseveringly, must have raised very large supplies, even from the stubborn and unyielding soil of the desert. And these supplies being entirely for cattle, as already noticed, would go a great way toward their support.

There remains only one more, and that a very important, means of supply (by natural means) to be considered. Again, Canon Stanley shows convincingly, that the copper mines of Egypt, and monuments and hieroglyphics in Surabit-el-Khadim, and the Wady Mughareh; the ruined cities of Edom and Petra; demonstrate a far greater traffic and population in early ages than now. (Colenso, p. 74.) To all this the Bishop replies, "This does not help to prove in any way that two millions of people, with their two millions of sheep and oxen, could have lived under Sinai for twelve months, and could have been maintained for forty years," &c. (Colenso, p. 74.) This certainly is a dogma of the most startling description. Not *help* to prove in any way? Are we to ignore our geography altogether, as well as our history? Is Egypt, too, "incredible and impossible," and the Red sea a mirage? We have been in the habit of thinking that Egypt has been one mighty granary for the nations, from the days of Jacob till now. We have fancied the Red sea a great highway of commerce, even *before* the

navies of Hiram and Solomon floated upon it. (1 Kings ix. 26, 27.) But, perhaps, this is all a mere play of the imagination. Egypt never grew corn, (though we have seen mummy wheat) and no boat ever sailed the Red sea, till the P. and O. Company rose.

This, however, we can hardly believe. And therefore we think that *vast* supplies did come across the desert, from Egypt on one side, and the Red sea on the other. And these *vast* supplies added to the *considerable* ones, raised by the labour of half a million of men, might well supply two million head of cattle,* even for the twelve months under Sinai" (Colenso, p. 74); and these are the natural means of support.

(2.) Enquiry as to supernatural means of support, *i.e.*, by miraculous interference.

Now the Bishop lays it down as a law, that, where there is no miracle recorded, there we must not assume one. And —aware of the value of so powerful an ally—he pounces down on and captures the Canon aforesaid, and employs him in his own artillery. These are serious odds to struggle against; still we must do it as we may. What then does Canon Stanley say? This. "As we have no warrant to take away (from holy writ), so we have no warrant to add." (Colenso p. 70.)

To this—Canon Stanley's *Canon*—we entirely subscribe, heartily, and *ex animo*. But we must take leave to demur a little to his *application* of it. We have read his book with the greatest delight—regarding it as the most complete, exact, learned, and at the same time interesting—in fact, *best* work on the Holy Land which we are acquainted with. But then—we are a little afraid that the learned Canon himself

* Amount of food required by the cattle. Kahsch says, (Colenso. p. 77) "The inhabitants of these climates require comparatively little food." (The writer has often seen an Arab dine off a flat cake of bread and a few dates.) Whereupon Bishop C. asks: "Is the same true of sheep and oxen in those climates?" Yes. They eat about as much in proportion to our cattle, as a Highland or Welsh pony compared to a stall-fed horse. Besides, as an Irishman would say, some of the Bishop's sheep were *goats*. (Exodus xii. 5.)

is of a somewhat "incredulous" turn of mind too—though to a far less extent than the Bishop of Natal. For, if we remember right, he allows no more than some four or five spots, in all Palestine and Jerusalem, to be genuinely and *bona fide*, holy. Now we confess to being quite unprepared to relinquish all the cherished and pious traditions of ages of Christians, reaching back to the times of Constantine and Helena, and most likely beyond them. This uproots all the hallowed and soul-stirring emotions so dear to the *pilgrim:* and the *traveller* might spare himself both the dangers and fleas.

Canon Stanley then applies his Canon in this way. "It is no answer to say that they, *i.e.* the Israelites, were maintained by miracles," for "if we have no warrant to take away, we have no warrant to add." That is, in other words, we must not suppose a miracle, where no particular miracle is recorded. And we demur, we say, to this application of his rule. If the sacred writer affirm and declare, most expressly, that his history *is* altogether miraculous—and Moses does this, (Deuteronomy iv. 37, ix. 29, and *passim*), if he tells us all along of Almighty favour and Almighty command—if he records, page after page, miracles of the most stupendous kind—if he tells us that a signal of God's presence was constantly abiding with them (Exodus xl. 38),—if, in short, his history is one avowedly miraculous, from the first to the last—are we not entitled to believe, when miraculous events are related, that a miracle occurred, though it be not recorded? On the contrary, we think it a legitimate part of the commentator's duty, to show, in answer to objections, how such and such things *might* take place. He must not indeed bind people to receive them, but he surely may, and *must* say, where a miraculous event is recorded, that *there* a miracle was done; for he says no more than this to those who object. Such event, is not, as you term it, *impossible*, if you will only believe God's hand to have wrought there. "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth." (Mark ix. 23.)

Therefore, we think we *have* a right to say of such a circumstance as is now being considered, that God's hand, some way or other, we know not how, was there. This view will apply to much of what has been treated of before. We hope therefore that the present objection is fully answered as well as others. The flight, borrowing, march, and maintenance, are no longer incredible, or impossible, and though we think we have shown this on natural means only being supposed; yet we contend that Scripture *does* warrant us to believe that Divine counsel, grace, and aid, were given, even in places where not EXPRESSLY recorded.

There is one point more under this objection, which for the sake of completeness, must not be omitted. "The Israelites under Sinai," says Bishop Colenso, "must have found it in winter, *bitterly cold.*" Why? Because "in the mountainous districts it is very cold in the winter nights." (Colenso, p. 79.) Certainly, if the people got upon the heights, it would be *bitterly* cold. But if, as was the case, they kept to the plains below, it would only be moderately so. The writer has seen snow from the plains of Baalbec, not many hundred feet above his head, on the slopes of the Lebanon, and this in July or August, when the sun was striking down as a furnace of fire. And the Israelites had cattle, and therefore skins at command. And lastly, where did the Israelites obtain fuel for cooking and warming? Answer: By way of Egypt or the Red Sea.

OBJECTION XII.

THE NUMBER OF THE ISRAELITES COMPARED WITH THE EXTENT OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.

This objection is founded on Exodus xxiii. 27–30, and would be more clear if entitled—"The objection of the wild beasts."

ANSWER.

The Bishop compares the population of Palestine with that of three English counties and also with that of Natal. He finds no fault with the amount of population, but only with there being any "danger" expressed (verse 29) "of the land lying desolate by the multiplying of the beasts of the field." (Colenso, p. 83.)

We really have nothing whatever to say to the Bishop's "lions, elephants, rhinoceroses, and hippopotami." (Col. p. 83.) (We never heard of the last in a purely Syrian menagerie.) Perhaps in a country where there are mountains, caves, dens, and holes, and where the people had no fire-arms, they stood their ground longer against the march of civilization. They might be exceedingly mischievous to crops, if not kept in good order. There are plenty of very troublesome jackals even at the present day. There were "lions" and many "foxes" down to the time of Sampson. (Judges. xiv. 11.) We can say no more. *Davus sum, non Van Amburgh.*

OBJECTION XIII.

THE NUMBER OF FIRST-BORN COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF MALE ADULTS.

This objection is founded on Num. iii. 43, "All the first-born males, from a month old and upwards, of those that were numbered, were twenty and two thousand two hundred and threescore and thirteen."

And it is this,—The number of the first born *males* being 22,273, whilst the number of males of 20 years and upwards must have been (by the Pentateuchal account) not less than 900,000; therefore *every mother of Israel must have had on the average forty-two sons* (Colenso, p. 84).

ANSWER.

First of all, both the above numbers (we think) must be received as correct. For, as the adult males were more than 600,000 by the Pentateuch history (Exodus xxxviii. 26, and Numbers i. 46), then the whole number of males *must*, at least, be 900,000. Neither can it be allowed that the number of first-born males (22,273), is an error of transcription, because, as the Bishop clearly shows, we find 22,000 of them redeemed by the 22,000 Levites, and the remaining 273 redeemed by money (Numbers iii. 39, 45, 46), (Colenso, pp. 86, 87). If then, the first-born males of *the whole population* be 22,273, the consequence is inevitable, and each mother in Israel *had*, on an average, forty-two children. This point then, *i.e.*, whether the first-born of the whole population *is here numbered*, is the only question at issue, and to this our attention must now be directed.

Here we are going to use the "Doctrine of Limits." We are going to *suppose* that the first-borns numbered, were so within a certain limit. But, as perhaps we shall not be permitted to make even a supposition (which may be true or false), without giving the reason why, we will first do so. It is this. As the subject is now left, we are obliged to believe one or other of two very incredible things, viz. :—

I. That each Jewish mother had on an average forty-two male children ; * or

II. That a writer demanding to be believed inspired, should assert such a monstrous absurdity.

Fixed on the horns of so sharp a dilemma, there is no relief left but to suppose that *a part*, not *the whole* of the first-borns was numbered.

Still, this is only at present an "empirical" law—a mere supposition which a fact may throw down, or a fact may establish. It must then be tested by facts, and its likelihood stand or fall by them. And, as we are quite sure the Bishop

* Or, rather 21 male children; for Kurtz cuts them down to that number at one blow .He also makes further reductions, amounting to (say) from 10 to 15 per cent. (Colenso, pp. 85, 86.)

will never allow our "Theory of Limitations" to be applied to the Pentateuch, unless we can bring something in its favour out of the Pentateuch itself, we will now give the limit we suppose, and then test it by the Mosaic books.

We think then, that the first-born males numbered, were limited in some way, and now to find what the limit was.

(1) *All firstborns* were to be the Lord's, (Ex. xiii. 2, 12) but all might be redeemed (v. 13). (2) The first-born males were redeemed thus: 22,000 of them were redeemed by the 22,000 Levites being vicariously accepted for God's service in their stead. (Numbers iii. 12, 39, 45.) (3) There then remained 273 first-born males to be redeemed. Now what was the amount of money fixed for their redemption? It was *five shekels.* (v. 46, 47, 50.)

This five shekels is the clue by which we discover what the first-borns were that were numbered. They were *the first-born males, of children under five years old:* "if it be from a month old even unto *five years old*, then thy estimation shall be of the *male*, five shekels of silver." (Lev. xxvii. 6.) Thus five shekels was the ransom of children under five years old. This, the writer thinks, is a clearly established *fact.* For it is a most singular coincidence that the 273 first-borns actually numbered, pay exactly the same ransom ordered for children under five years old. It is still more singular that all males above five years old, were set at different and far higher rates of redemption (Leviticus xxvii.), and yet the 273 first-borns numbered, paid only five shekels each, the same as all under five years were rated at. Had any of the 273 been *over* five years, surely they would have paid their proportionate ransom ordered by Leviticus xxvii. But they did not. Their legal case too, presents a most striking coincidence. The males under five, of Leviticus xxvii. 6, were "vowed." (v. 2.) So were the first-borns, by God's command. (Exodus xiii. 2, 12.) The ransom *ordered* for the males under five, is five shekels. The ransom *paid* by the first-born is five shekels too. (Numbers iii. 47, 50.)

Therefore we think our supposition that the first-borns

numbered, were the first-borns from "a month old even unto five years old," is no longer a supposition, but a fact—and a fact established by the sacred writer himself.

It is, however, but fair to see what can be said on the other side. If it be said this law applies only to one who has made "a singular vow" (Lev. xxvii. 2), we answer, a child under five could not make such a vow. If it be urged to this, that his father might for him, as in the case of a Nazarite (Numbers vi. 21), we answer, it cannot be so, for the ransom of a Nazarite was totally different. (Numbers vi. 13–20.) And moreover, the law of the Nazarite, which allowed of a termination to his vow (v. 13), does not apply here. And still more, and conclusively, from Leviticus xxvii. 28, where it is said, "No devoted thing.....both of man and beast.....shall be sold or *redeemed*."

So again, when the Bishop says that "the question is decided at once" (p. 90), because "Moses numbered, as the Lord commanded him *all the firstborn* among the children of Israel,"* we answer, Yes, *all within a certain limit*—the limit being supplied by Moses himself, in Lev. xxvii. 6.

It remains only to see whether statistics contradict this. Take the whole population at the Exodus at two and a half millions. This is half a million more than Bishop C., taking a moderate estimate, rates them at, in p. 35. Take half of these, 1,250,000, as males. This, again, is rather more than the census tables of 1861 show. Then, since by the Table below, most kindly furnished the writer by the Registrar General,† the number of males under five years old is about

* Numbers iii. 42.

† ENGLAND AND WALES. CENSUS OF 1851.

Proportion per Cent. of Children under 5 years of Age, to the Total Population of *each sex*.

Age.	Males and Females.	Males.	Females.
Under 5 years ...	13.01	13.21	12.81

Note. The *Ages* of the Population for 1861 are not yet ascertained, but it is not likely that the proportions at the different ages will differ materially from those in 1851.

General Register Office, Somerset House,
November 28, 1862.

13 per cent. of the whole male population; we have for the whole Israelitish males under five years, the number 162,500. The ratio of the Mosaic firstborn (22,273) to this, is the ratio of 1 to $7\frac{1}{3}$ nearly. In other words, the ratio of firstborn males of all ages to the males of all ages was then less than 1 to 8. Therefore each mother in Israel, at that time, had on an average, not more than 8 children in all. For we may suppose there were as many firstborn females as males. Some of Kurtz's remarks farther reduce this average (Colenso, 85, 86). This is not a high average when we consider the early marriages and long life at that period (see Objection xiv).

And thus, interpreting scripture by scripture—interpreting Num. iii. 42 by Lev. xxvii. 6,—the above arguments prove, that the Mosaic number of firstborn males is consistent both with itself and also with actual statistical facts, and is therefore not only possible and credible, but most reliable as to accuracy.

But we cannot quite leave the subject here. There is another point proved by thus "searching the scripture;" a point most important to all students of Holy Writ. What the search has brought to light is most assuredly this: that Moses was no false or fictitious historian, avoiding with cunning, or even with common care, the risk of recording anything improbable or impossible, but that he writes on the contrary, as a straightforward, open, and honest man would do, not glossing, extenuating, or smoothing down any one of the wonderful events he narrates; but, conscious of the truth of his words, is utterly regardless of vindicating his own faithfulness, leaving mighty Truth to vindicate Herself, —and thus forces from our heart's core the unavoidable confession,—"Now, by this *I know* that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth, is TRUTH. (1 Kings, xvii. 24.)

Here the Bishop calls a halt, and gives us the *terminus ad quem* he has reached. Being somewhat tired with the

march, and having heavy ground in the front, we are glad to obey, and follow his example. We will end, then, this part of our task, by giving a little paraphrase of his words in this place; first warning the reader that it is by no means an accurate, or even faithful transcript of Colenso on the Pentateuch, page 90: "By this time, surely, *no* doubt can have arisen in the mind of one single reader, as to the historical veracity of any portion of the Pentateuch. This belief in its truth, I am sure, will be confirmed into a certain conviction, by its appearing plainly from the data of the Pentateuch itself, that there *was* such a vast population as recorded to come out of Egypt; in other words, that the children of Israel, at the time of the Exodus, could and did, if we only attend carefully to the distinct statements of the narrative, amount to two millions."

OBJECTION XIV.

THE NUMBERS OF THE ISRAELITES AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS.

This objection is as follows:—

The number of the adult males at the time of the Exodus, was, according to Moses, 600,000; but it could not have been 5,000 according to Bishop Colenso. (p. 103.)

ANSWER.

We must admit the two following propositions as being fully proved by the Bishop from Scripture, viz:

(1.) That the children of Israel came out of Egypt about 215 years after they went down thither in the time of Jacob.

And (2.) That they came out in the fourth generation from the adults in the prime of life, who went down with Jacob. (Colenso, chap. xv. and xvi. and p. 100.)

Having established these two points, the Bishop adds, that from this "it can be shown, beyond a doubt, that it is quite impossible there should have been, at the time of the Exodus, so many as 600,000 male adults, provided *we take the data to be derived from the Pentateuch itself.*" (Colenso, p. 101.)

It is our task now, to show that this *is possible*, and we shall for convenience sake, divide our argument into two parts and show (I.) That the number (600,000), is possible, leaving out the Pentateuch data; and (II.) that it is possible, taking them in.

(I.) The number is possible in itself. Now, the Bishop takes $4\frac{1}{2}$ sons to be the average number to each man. We shall suppose an average to each man more than three times as great, viz. 15.* Our supposition (of 15), we admit to be much greater than that of the Bishop, but still not impossible in itself. For the sake of shewing the contrast of numbers in each generation, and the final result, we shall give the Arithmetic of the Bishop's and our own calculation. Thus—

BISHOP COLENSO'S ARITHMETIC.		THE WRITER'S ARITHMETIC.	
12	Sons of Jacob	12	Sons of Jacob
$4\frac{1}{2}$		15	
54	Males in Kohath's generation	180	Males in Kohath's generation
$4\frac{1}{2}$		15	
243	Ditto in Amram's generation	2700	Ditto in Amram's generation
$4\frac{1}{2}$		15	
1094	Ditto in Moses' generation	40,500	Ditto in Moses' generation
$4\frac{1}{2}$		15	
4923	Ditto in Joshua's generation	607,500	Ditto in Joshua's generation

Thus, instead of 4923, our average makes the adult males in Joshua's generation a few thousands *more* than those given in the Pentateuch, which are 603,550. The reader must remember here, that Joshua's generation is the generation at the time of the Exodus; Joshua being then about forty years old.

Now we will not attempt to disguise that this average

* Of course it lies with us to prove that this average is possible, subject to both (I.) and (II.) This will be given farther on.

(of 15) is a very high, nay more, at first sight, a very improbable, average. For it involves the fact of each man having on an average fifteen daughters as well as fifteen sons, thus making the average number of children to each man no less than *thirty*. The following considerations however, will show that it is not impossible, nor yet beyond the bounds of credibility.

(1.) Cases do occur of families between twenty and thirty living children, begotten by one husband of one wife.* This relieves the impossibility.

(2.) The probability is increased, by the fact of Eastern marriages taking place at a very early age, often at sixteen years, and even less. Such early marriages probably took place in Judah's family. (See Genesis xxxviii.)

(3.) The improbability is done away, by the practices of polygamy and concubinage. For if a man *can* have twenty children by one wife, he *may* have thirty by several. The Pentateuch furnishes many instances of these practices, and also other parts of Scripture frequently.

(4.) The great age to which men lived down to the time of Moses. (See Pentateuch *passim.*)

(5.) The great age, also, at which the men begat, and the women conceived, children. The Pentateuch gives as

* We give the following instance from a quaint old Epitaph, (kindly supplied by a friend, James Beard, Esq., Tormarton), on one Gabriel Russell, in Tormarton Church, Gloucestershire. The monument records Gabriel's death in 1663, at 88, and his wife in 1667, at 90 years old.

> "Here Gabriell Russell lies, whos watchfull eyes
> Were William, Marques of Newcasell spies;
> Over three parishes, his onely hands,
> Were there entrusted with his Lordship's lands.
> Full ninty yeares my Father and I,
> Ware Sarvants to that Nobillity;
> Byt all that knew them, did them witnes bare,
> Of their just dealings, loyalty, and care,
> And for their comfort here below
> One and twenty children They could show."

Notwithstanding the disregard for Lindley Murray, caused by one of the Beni-Russell dipping his oar in, the above shows that the worthy Gabriel had twenty-one living children; and there is nothing said or implied of his being a polygamist or having a second wife.

examples of this: Abraham and Sarah (Genesis xvii. 17), and Amram and Jochabed, as to the latter (Exodus vi. 20).

(6.) The greater than natural fecundity promised by Almighty God, and given, and acknowledged. This appears from the following passages. "In multiplying, I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore" (Genesis xxii. 17, and xv. 5, and xvii. 6). "There shall not be male or female barren among you" (Deut. vii. 14, 13). "And the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty: and the land was filled with them" (Exodus i. 7). "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons, and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude" (Deut. x. 22). And, moreover, we are entitled to presume from these promises that more children were reared than in the ordinary course of nature.

And now we may ask the reader: Is there anything impossible, even suppose we leave out (6), is there anything improbable, that a man begetting children from the age of 20 to 100, having only one wife, bearing children from the age of say 18 to 90, should have 30 children? Is there any thing in such a man married to *several* such wives, having 30 children, or many more, that is not *highly probable?*

There is nothing, then, improbable in itself, that, under such conditions, the *average* may be fifteen sons to each man, and by consequence there be in the fourth generation 600,000, and more, male adults. For as many might have *less*, so many might have more. And be it noted of this, that nothing has been here advanced contrary to the Pentateuchal accounts, or Pentateuchal data, but entirely in accordance with them. And this is the proof of (I).

It now lies with us to prove, that our average of fifteen sons per man, necessitating more than 600,000 males in the time of the Exodus is

II. Possible, taking in the Pentateuchal data. The Bishop

says, that if we go by the Pentateuch, we *must* take his average of $4\frac{1}{2}$.* (p. 101 and 103, art. 115 and 118.) It lies with us to disprove this proposition. We therefore offer the following

Reasons for rejecting Bishop Colenso's average of $4\frac{1}{2}$.

(1.) Statement. The proposition translated into plain English, is this; that the twelve patriarchs had 53 sons and *no more*. (Colenso, p. 102).

(2.) We admit the above statement so far as the word "sons," but dispute the last three words.

(3.) The Bishop does not tell us why they had no more than 53 sons, but as he takes the number from Genesis xlvi., we presume he founds it on the words "All the souls," in verses 15, 22, 25, 26, 27.

(4.) Upon this we observe, that "all the souls" applies only to those who "came with Jacob into Egypt," by verses 26, 27. (That is, those who came there in Jacob's *life-time*, by answer to Objection II.)

(5.) The fact of Moses only recording the names of 53, does not prove there were no more, because he only records the names of those who were "heads of houses," or tribes. "These be the heads of their fathers' houses." (Exodus vi. 14.) See also 1 Chron. iv. 38, which restricts its own genealogy, as well as that of Exodus to "heads" or "princes."

(6.) It is not likely that Moses would record more than the heads or chiefs of houses. N.B. We hope the Bishop is not discontented that Moses and Chronicles do not give the names of the whole 600,000, as we confess we cannot share his grief in this.

(7.) If the twelve patriarchs had no more than 53 sons, the following consequence is unavoidable: viz., Twelve men (each of whom had begotten sons already), in the prime of life, go down to Egypt, with "their wives" (Genesis xlvi. 5), and not one of them begets another son. This, we think,

* It will be seen the whole argument turns upon (1) whether we are obliged by the Pentateuch to take the Bishop's *average* of $4\frac{1}{2}$ or not; the writer maintains *not*: and (2) whether the Pentateuch contradicts our own average of 15, which hitherto, so far as we have yet gone, it does not, but the contrary.

approaches far nearer to the bounds of the "incredible and impossible" than anything the Bishop has produced from the Pentateuch. It is in utter defiance of all probability.

For these reasons, we assert therefore that the Bishop's average of $4\frac{1}{2}$, *must be rejected.*

Here perhaps, we might stop. We have shown the average of $4\frac{1}{2}$ to be untenable by the Pentateuch. We have shown the average of 15 has nothing "impossible" in its nature, and so far as we have yet seen, is perfectly consistent with the Pentateuch. Still, we will not rest satisfied here, but see if the Bishop adduces any arguments to throw down this average.

Our average has assumed that "polygamy was the rule." "Assumed without proof," says the Bishop. (p. 117.) Answer. Abraham, Esau, Jacob, Judah (concubinage), were polygamists. The divine promise to "multiply Abraham's seed as the stars," involves the necessity of polygamy. It is also a recognised institution throughout the whole of the O. T. The sons of Issachar were certainly great polygamists, and had many sons, by 1 Chron. vii. 4.

We have searched carefully for any other objection to our average, but can find none. All the other objections of the Bishop, turn, either upon the necessity of his average of $4\frac{1}{2}$, which we have rejected, or on his impossibility of the first-borns, which has already been overthrown.

We therefore sum up thus: That the average of 15 sons,* though undoubtedly not in the list of "ordinary occurrences" (p. 120), is not impossible, nor even highly improbable in itself: that it is quite consistent with the Pentateuchal account: that the promises of God in the Pentateuch make it most probable: that the account of the Pentateuch makes a high average *necessary* (Exodus vi. 7, and Numbers i. 46): and that this average gives at the time of the Exodus more than 600,000 male adults.

* Only three more than Jacob had.

It will be seen we have taken no account at all of any of Jacob's shepherds and herdsmen going down into Egypt with him. If such were the fact, it would of course, greatly reduce our average of 15. This we have left out, because their emigration is not necessary; but not because it is not probable. On the contrary, we maintain it as *most probable.* The analogy of Abraham, Lot, Esau, Jacob, and Judah, whose servants or shepherds travelled with them, make it more probable that they did so in the Descent to Egypt, than that they did not. The fact that "the flocks and herds" were taken to Egypt (Genesis xlvi. 32), makes it all but certain. Jacob had his herdsmen with him before, and how, as he advanced in years, can he be supposed to do otherwise now? When we hear of a flock of sheep being at market, we are obliged to suppose somebody brought them. Farmers who have shepherds, do not usually drive their own flocks to market, or fresh pasturage. There is no reason, but the contrary, why Jacob and the patriarchs should be exceptions to this rule. We cannot, therefore, avoid believing, that the servants and herdsmen went down with the patriarchs, and were many of them incorporated with their families. The Hebrew Ben, meaning "foster son," makes this highly probable. (See note, p. 53.) This is the only way, too, we can see, of explaining who that "mixed multitude" were, that joined in the Exodus. Here, again, is another result of the arithmetic test. The "flocks and herds" had no one to look after them, because no attendants are mentioned. This is another necessary offspring of the alliance between domineering arithmetic and poor hen-pecked history.*

* "Humano capiti cervicem Pastor equinam
Jungere si velit, &c.
Spectatum admissi, risum teneatis, amici?" Hor. A. P. 1.

OBJECTION XV.

THE DANITES AND LEVITES AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS.

Is founded on the four following passages: Gen. xlvi. 23; Num. xxvi. 42; Num. ii. 26; and Num. xxvi. 43; and is this:—

The warriors of Dan's tribe at the time of the Exodus ought to have been only 27 instead of 62,700.

ANSWER.

We do not know by what process the Bishop makes the sons of Dan only 27. We make them 100 (round numbers), taking his average at 4½ and that Dan had only one son. But this does not matter, for it is not the point. Where does the Bishop discover that Dan had one son *only?* Not in Gen. xlvi. 23, certainly, by (5, page 47) still less by Num. xxvi. 42, for here the historian distinctly tells us he is naming the "heads of houses" (see also Exodus vi. 14). "These are the sons of Dan *after their families*, of Shuham, the family of the Shuhamites. These are the families of Dan after their families." "These are the sons of Dan," he says; but how? not as an only son, but "after their families." The whole objection thus falls at once to the ground, for Dan may have had many more sons.

N.B. If the reader wish to enquire how it is the families of Dan were only one, he is referred to 1 Chron. xxiii. 11, where it would seem that two families were sometimes incorporated together into one; at least in David's time.

Here again we remark how the arithmetical test or canon has been brought out in full force. Because the name of one son of Dan is given, we are to understand he has no more. Just as if, to return to our old friend William the Conqueror again, if an historian should say that William Rufus was son of the Conqueror, and was head of a family; therefore tho aforesaid Conqueror *cannot* have had any other son! Q.N.E.D.

Next, the same argument holds good with regard to the numbers of the Levites at the Exodus.

The Bishop also objects to the small increase of the Levites; viz., that they only increased from 22,000 to 23,000 in thirty-eight years.

Answer. The number of the Levites appears to have been limited by some dispensation of Providence not recorded. They were at the *first* census less by ten thousand, than the least of all the tribes (Manasseh). Some, we may presume, fell among the 14,700 who died of plague for murmuring (Num. xvi. 49); some more also among the 24,000 who fell for idolatry at Shittim (Num. xxv. 9). If we attribute it to the hand of the Almighty, there is nothing surprising in it. If we disallow this, there is still nothing impossible nor incredible in believing some limitation in marrying, or some casualty befel them; nothing that affects in any way the historic truth of the Pentateuch.

N.B. It will be seen that no notice is taken of the objections in p. 111. Art. (131) and (132), because they are already met by the results of answers to objections xiii., xiv., and xv.

OBJECTION XVI.

THE NUMBER OF PRIESTS AT THE EXODUS, COMPARED WITH THEIR DUTIES, AND WITH THE PROVISION MADE FOR THEM.

The objection is (mainly) this:—

That the number of priests was insufficient to perform various duties specified by Bishop Colenso, p. 122, 123.

ANSWER.

The whole force of the objection rests on the number of priests, which, according to the Bishop were only three, viz. Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar.

Our argument is, to show that there were many more priests than these three. First, we admit that after the death of Nadab and Abihu, Aaron had no sons living, besides Eleazar and Ithamar. (Leviticus x. 16.) But we maintain, there were many more priests than three, for the following reasons:

(1.) Aaron was about 84 years old at the time of the Exodus. Therefore his sons, Eleazar and Ithamar, might easily be of the ages of 64 and 63 at that time.

(2.) For reasons already given (Answer to Obj. XIV.) they may have had 15 sons each, those of Eleazar ranging from 44 to 30 years of age (suppose); those of Ithamar from 43 to 27; at the same time of the Exodus. This gives us at once thirty additional priests.

(3.) The two eldest sons of Eleazar may easily have had four sons above 20 years old, between them, and the two eldest of Ithamar one such each. This gives six more priests.

Adding all these together, we have 36 priests besides Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar. And, be it observed, this is a low estimate, for there may have been more.

This, however, is not all. There is every probability that Aaron had more sons than Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar; and consequently that there were many more priests: thus,

(*a.*) It is unlikely that a man who lived to be 123 (Numbers xxxiii. 39), and when polygamy was allowed, should have had no more than four sons.

(*b.*) Suppose him to have had only two more sons. These two also might have had 15 sons each, over 20. Thus we we get 30 more priests.

(*c.*) Add to all this that more children would be coming of age, to be made priests during the pilgrimage in the wilderness.

Adding all these together, except (*c*), we have a total of 69 priests at the time of the Exodus; and many of these, no doubt, having families of children.

Is there anything in the Scripture to overthrow this calculation? The writer can find no reason there for doing so. It is no answer to say, that Aaron and his sons were consecrated, and that he had only two living. For the word sons, in Exodus xxix. 8, and in Leviticus viii. 2, is a word that means descendants, quite as much as actual sons.* (Sept. υἱοὺς Vulg. *liberos* and *filios*.) Neither is it any answer to say that because four are named, therefore he had no more. For both Exodus and Chronicles name only "heads of houses" (Exodus vi. 14), or "princes in their families." (1 Chron. iv. 38, and v. 24, and vii. 3.) And moreover, it may be added that what is recorded (in 1 Chron. xxiii. 11, and xxiv. 3–5), makes it very probable that children of Aaron's deceased sons were enrolled in the families of Eleazar and Ithamar.

Thus, as we contend, Scripture does not forbid, but encourages us to believe that there were as many as 69 priests at the time of the Exodus, and many more coming on. Let us apply this number to Bishop Colenso's test of 500 sacrifices with five minutes' time for each. Each priest would have seven such sacrifices, and would be employed 35 minutes! And, we have taken, in all this, no account whatever of Aaron's daughters' sons, who are included by the Hebrew word *Ben*, nor yet of his "foster sons." Both these would add amazingly to the number of priests. It is needless to go farther, for 69 priests only, destroy all the objections of this chapter, except that—

We have still in this place to notice—The objection of the birds. We have only to say that Gesenius does not attempt to define exactly what the birds were, whether "doves," pigeons, or others. The Bishop himself does not affirm them to be certainly "pigeons." He can "scarcely believe" that birds of the wilderness, were found in such numbers as is implied by the offering of them after child-birth. (p. 126.) But this does not prove they were not there, and it is not

* בן according to Gesenius, means "a son;" "a grandson;" "*a foster son*;" and it belongs to poetic diction when "sons of the Grecians" is used. We here offer our best thanks to a lady-friend, for her valuable help in the Hebrew.

incredible or impossible they should have been. We think therefore, unless it could be proved *what* the birds were, no objection can lie, and must therefore be ignored. And now, having got through the objection of "the Birds," as well as of the "Beasts," we feel thankful to find that the Fishes have no objection at all; we will therefore pass on to

OBJECTION XVII.

THE PRIESTS AND THEIR DUTIES AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE PASSOVER.

This objection resolves itself into two parts: and is

I. That the 150,000 lambs at the Passover could not have been slain in the Court of the Tabernacle (Col. p. 132).

II. That the Priests could not have sprinkled the blood of these lambs on the altar (p. 131).

ANSWER.

I. That the 150,000 lambs at the Passover could not have been killed in the Court of the Tabernacle.

To answer this objection, we shall (1) enquire what the law of the Passover was at the time of its institution; and (2) whether anything in the Mosaic law required the Paschal lamb to be slain *in* the Court.

(1) The law of the Passover at its institution. It is quite certain that the Israelites did not slay the Passover at the door of the Tabernacle then, for the simple reason that the Tabernacle was not in existence. Neither is there at its first institution (Ex. vi.), any prospective law, as to what should be done thereafter; all that was ordered then, referred to that Passover, *i.e.*, the one on the night of the flight: "Every man" was to take "a lamb for an house;" or if the household were too little for the lamb, he and his neighbour took it together. (Ex. xii. 3, 4.) They were to "let nothing of

it remain until the morning; and that which remained of it until the morning, ye (*i.e.*, the people) shall burn with fire" (Ex. xii. 10). The people also were further ordered to sprinkle the blood in this manner:—"Ye shall strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood" (Ex. xii. 7, 22). From all this it is clear that they killed and ate the first passover *at their own homes.*

(2.) Whether the Mosaic law given afterwards, modifies this practice and compelled them to kill *in* the court of the Tabernacle. The Bishop says, that as all burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, and every animal killed, "*to offer an offering unto the Lord*" (Lev. xvii. 4), was commanded to be brought unto the door of the Tabernacle; therefore the paschal lamb was to be so brought also. We think otherwise, and for this reason. The sacrifice of the passover was a sacrifice *per se*, wholly distinct from all the other sacrifices. They all, as their names import, were *offertory* sacrifices, *i.e.*, sacrifices offered unto the Lord. But the passover was not an offertory sacrifice at all, none of it was offered to God. It was simply a *commemorative* or *memorial* sacrifice, commanded in remembrance of a mighty deliverance. (Ex. xii. 14, 25, 27.) The former as offertory sacrifices were *altarial*, *i.e.*, were burnt, in whole or in part, on the altar (Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, iii. 5, 11, 16, iv. 10, v. 6, 7,). The latter was, strictly speaking, not altarial at all, none of it being burned or even laid on the altar, but was eaten at home, and its remains, if any, there burnt. We have therefore no right to say from the Mosaic law, that the paschal lambs were killed *in* the court of the tabernacle; for the law of offertory sacrifices does not apply to them, and there is nothing of the sort commanded as to the passover itself.

But then, as the Bishop justly observes, by 2 Chr. xxx. 16, and xxxv. 11—"The priests sprinkled the blood from their hands and the Levites slayed them;" *i.e.*, the paschal lambs: so also he shows, that "in the time of Hezekiah and Josiah, when it was desired to keep the passover strictly, in such sort as it was written," 2 Chr. xxx. 5, the lambs were mani-

festly killed *in the court of the temple.* No doubt they were killed in the court, for the same reason, and therefore after the same practice as in the time of Moses; but most certainly not because it is so written in Moses' law, for that it is not. And what *must* have been the practice in the time of Moses? This: if the priests were to sprinkle the blood on the altar, then the lambs must have been slain *near the tabernacle*, but not of necessity *in* its court. Thus it was a matter of *convenience*, not of *law;* and being thus slain, *in and about* the court of the tabernacle in the time of Moses, nothing could be a more exact imitation of *this practice*, than to slay them in Hezekiah's time in the court of the temple.

We, therefore, conclude that in Moses' time there was no law to compel the killing of the paschal lambs in the court of the tabernacle. But since it was convenient that they should all be together in one place, in order that the priests might "sprinkle the blood," therefore the practice was to slay them near the tabernacle; and that such was the practice, is not proved by any thing in Moses' law, but by the practice discovered in Chronicles.

This answers the whole of I., for the lambs were not killed *in* the court, but in and about it. It, also, answers all of ([161] p. 132). We pass on to

II. That the priests could not have sprinkled the blood of the 150,000 lambs.

We cannot discover that the priests sprinkled the blood of each lamb separately. It certainly is not so said or implied in the texts brought forward by the Bishop, and which we have already considered. But grant it so to be. The objection is founded on there being only three priests, and this is already met by Answer to Objection XVI.

We cannot help expressing, here, the hope that some learned scholar of the Hebrew race, some "master of Israel," may also give us an Answer to Bishop Colenso. For our considerations of Jewish rite and genealogy have been conducted only so far as to show, that there is nothing either impossible,

incredible, or historically untrue in the Pentateuch. We should greatly like therefore to see how the Jews, ancient and modern, expound their own genealogies, and legal rites, &c. Such a work would throw great light upon interesting points, and had such one, in popular style been in existence, we think the work of Bishop Colenso could never have been written.

OBJECTION XVIII.

THE WAR ON MIDIAN.

This objection is founded on Numbers xxxi.

The Bishop objects to the war on Midian, (I) on the ground of its impossibility, and (II) on that of its immorality.

ANSWER.

I. With regard to its impossibility. "We are called on to believe," says the Bishop, "that 12,000 Israelites killed 48,000 men, pillaged their property, demolished their castles, destroyed their towns, and carried off 100,000 captives, and all without the loss of a single man." (Colenso, p. 144.)

Now if we are speaking to those who deny that God *can* and that God *has* wrought miracles; to Atheists in short—we have nothing to say. For to argue with such, is to enter on a totally different argument than we are treating of here. To the fool that saith in his heart, "There is no God," we say nothing now. But to those who do believe in God, we would say, what is there impossible or incredible in this? Remember, the sacred writer always tells you he is recording miraculous events; the doings of God, not those of men. If he tells us that not they, but "the Lord their God, should destroy the nations with a mighty destruction, . . . that

no man should be able to stand before them until they were destroyed" (Deuteronomy vii. 23, 24); if he tells us that God says, "I will cast out the nations before thee" (Exodus xxxiv. 24); what wonder then that "five of them should chase an hundred, and an hundred of them should put ten thousand to flight, and their enemies should fall before them by the sword?" (Lev. xxvi. 8.) For it is no longer Israel but God. "They got not the land by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them, but God's right hand and his arm, because He had a favour unto them." (Psalm xliv. 3.) It is not Moses, it is not Joshua, it is not Israel triumphs, but it is "the Lord of Hosts." "With our enemies," is Israel's boast, "is the arm of flesh; but with us is the Lord our God, to fight our battles." (2 Chron. xxxii. 8.) To Him then belongs the power, and the victory, and the triumph, "who brake the arrows of the bow, the shield, the sword, and the battle." (Psalm lxxvi. 3.) "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the *victory*, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all." (1 Chron. xxix. 11.)

II. With regard to its immorality. The remark made in Answer to Objection I. may here be repeated. If the destruction of the Midianites was by God's command, we must be certain that it was righteous, for "shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Nevertheless, since God in his Holy Word has been pleased to show the reason why such stern punishments as the slaughter of Midian were executed, we may lawfully examine them. First, however, we would make one or two introductory remarks of a general nature.

Thus, then, whatever is recorded of the acts of God's people must be considered as cases *wholly exceptional*. The history and circumstances of the Jews, were, all throughout, entirely exceptional. Their civil and social law, as well as their very existence and abode, were all for a particular purpose. They were God's people, governed by God himself for

an especial purpose—the preserving His knowledge, His word, and His worship, amid a heathen world. Their civil and social laws are therefore no *precedents* for us. For the same reason, none of their acts contrary to God's law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. xix. 18), are precedents either. The Jews themselves could not disobey the above law without a direct *warrant* from heaven. Still less, if possible, can we dare to violate this law, until we can plead a like manifest warrant from its divine Author.

By this rule we must estimate many acts recorded in the Old Testament. He who made the law, alone could dispense with its observance. When his people *did* dispense with it, they did so by direct warrant from Him. This will explain many dark passages of Jewish story, which seem at first sight to us, unrighteous and cruel. Thus the act of Jael to Sisera, viewed as an act of man, is one of such cold-blooded treachery and cruelty, that even a heathen could reprobate it as an accursed deed.* Viewed as an act of God, done by his warrant and interference, it is God striking down an enemy of himself; it is His "right hand" dealing out due vengeance on a cruel oppressor, too mighty for man's. But this is no precedent to us, and we cannot follow it, until we can show the same divine warrant. The same of the slaughter of the Midianites. It was a punishment inflicted, not by man. It was not Moses, it was not Israel that destroyed them, but that God to whom "belongeth vengeance and recompense" (Deut. xxxii. 35). And why were they and other nations so utterly destroyed? Because they had sinned against God and man, a long time, and without repentance, and God's longsuffering would no longer bear with them; and the "sickle was now put in," because "the harvest was ripe" to be cut down; for "their wickedness was great." (Joel iii. 13.) Five hundred years God spared them; five hundred years his people were strangers to the promised land; because the "iniquity of

* "Et penetralia,
Sparsisse nocturno cruore
Hospitis."—Hor. 2 Ode, xiii. 6—8.

the Amorites was not yet full." (Genesis xv. 16.) Not for God's "favour to Sion," "but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee." (Deut. ix. 4.) "The land is defiled" saith God, "therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. (Lev. xviii. 25.) And these Midianites. They were the vile and vicious idolaters of St. Paul; men who had "changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man,..... given up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts." (Romans i. 24.) They had seduced Israel to join in their foul whoredoms, and worship in their vile idolatries. (Numbers xxv. 1, 2.) Therefore the sentence of their righteous doom went forth; that "God to whom vengeance belongeth, shewed himself." Their "judgment," delayed so long, now "lingered" no more (2 Peter ii. 3), and their "damnation was just." (Rom. iii. 8.)

With regard to the slavery question here touched by the Bishop (page 144), the remarks already made under Objection I., and the present, appear to meet it. Slavery with the Jews is an exceptional condition and under an exceptional state of society, and therefore is no precedent for us. The slave was protected from murder by the law, "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall be surely put to death" (Ex. xxi. 12). He was protected from bodily injury by the law, "If a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish; he shall let him go free for his eye's sake" (Ex. xxi. 26). So also the same penalty for loss of a tooth (v. 27) [Dean Graves on Pentateuch, 156]. This is a very different matter from slavery as it exists now. There was, moreover, an inspired sanhedrim (Num. xi. 16, 25), in order to hear and judge complaints (Ex. xviii. 21, and xxiv. 1, 9). Until, therefore, we can shew all these conditions, we can draw from the Pentateuch no warrant for slavery now. We can, moreover, affirm it to be contrary to the spirit of the Christian Revelation. We agree, however, thus far, that to quote texts from the Pentateuch against it, especially by incautious hands, is a dangerous thing to do.

We have lastly, under this objection, to consider the possibility or impossibility of the events of the last six months of the pilgrimage being accomplished in that time. These events will be found collected in Bishop Colenso's Work, at pages 144, 146. We maintain their possibility, thus: Aaron died on the first day of the fifth month of the fortieth year of the wanderings; they mourned him a month. Allow, with the Bishop, for the conquest of Arad and his cities, another month. Allow, still with the Bishop, from Mount Hor by way of Red sea to Punon, including the plague of fiery serpents (compare Num. xxxiii. 41, 42 with xxi. 10), a fortnight. And now they are in full and rapid march for the Holy Land. This we may well believe, since they were under Almighty guidance (Num. ix. 23), and were assured by Divine promise of easy conquest (Lev. xxvi. 8). We see no reason why, thus supported, they should rest, as Kurtz presumes, on the way. For the nine marches from Punon to Pisgah then, say 180 miles, we allow only a fortnight. There is nothing in the history (Num. xxi.) to prevent us supposing that the conquests of Sihon and the Amorites of Jaazer, both small districts and close at hand, were not combined and simultaneous operations, carried out, as the war on Midian, by detached flying squadrons (Num. xxxi). Allow then for these two operations a fortnight. Let the conquest of Bashan be supposed not simultaneous with the above two, and being a small district about 30 miles off, allow it a fortnight to be overcome. These conquests were probably made by the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, (Num. xxxii. 1, 39,) who formed settlements there, but whose warriors went back to Moses for the conquest of Canaan (verses 18, 26, 27, 33).

We will now put the above into a table as follows :—

(1) Mourning for Aaron	1 Month.
(2) Conquest of Arad	1 „
(3) Mount Hor to Punon (by Red Sea)	½ „
(4) Punon to Pisgah	½ „
(5) Conquest of Sihon and Jaazar	½ „
(6) Conquest of Bashan	½ „
	4 Months.

There will then remain two months for the operations now mentioned and summed up by the Bishop, pages 145, 146. We will now consider the time for these. From Mount Abarim before Nebo, to the plains of Moab on this side of Jordan by or near Jericho (Num. xxxiii. 47, 48 and xxii. 1), would be a day's march. There they were spread from Beth-jeshimoth to Abel-shittim (Num. xxxiii. 48, 49), at which last place the idolatry took place (Num. xxv. 1). Allow a fortnight for the idolatry, plague, and numbering, in the plains of Moab. There will then remain six weeks save one day, for the conquest of Midian. And in such time, under the circumstances, this might reasonably be done.

Of course it is not to be supposed that such rapidity of events, belongs to the list of ordinary occurrences. Still it is not an impossibility for powerful armies so soon to sweep over, and make settlements in, districts by no means large, nor widely separated. It requires only a constant course of uninterrupted success. And this is just what, by Divine help, the Israelites had. If we only believe that the "Lord of Hosts" was with them, there is nothing incredible or difficult to believe in the rapid subjugation of the hostile tribes. And thus in the last, as in all other of the objections, we contend there is nothing incredible or impossible, or affecting in the least degree, the *historic truth of the Pentateuch.*

Digression. It will be seen that the writer has omitted entirely all consideration of two objections raised in the Bishop's preface, viz., the impossibility of the animals being gathered together in the ark; and that of an universal deluge. The reason for this omission is, his entire ignorance of Natural History and Geology. With regard to the former objection, since his lore as a Naturalist is almost limited to the knowing a cow from a horse, he can only offer a suggestion taken from higher authority. Dr. Lardner in his Museum of Science and Art, says, that "Naturalists have resolved the 'existing animal kingdom into four primary divisions.' (Vol. xi., p. 66.) These four are divided again into

different orders. "Naturalists have reduced animal forms to seventy-eight orders, in one of which man stands alone." (Vol. xii. p. 160.) These again are sub-divided into genera or generic forms, and of these he tells us 1867 is the total number in the human period of the world. (Vol. xii. p. 154.) These might have been received into the ark, and from them or less than them, if it so pleased God, all other animals have been derived.

Then again, though the writer is still less learned in Geology, is in fact no antediluvian at all, yet he contends that nothing the Bishop has said of the hills of Auvernge, which *may not* have always been "covered with light and loose substances," (preface p. viii.) can weigh against the universal belief of mankind, or sweep out of man's mind the ever admitted axiom—*Communis consensus stat pro ratione.*

Every result of Geology, has hitherto confirmed "most strikingly," the order of creation in Genesis, as is most ably stated by a high authority. (Lardner, Mus. Vol. xii. pp. 158-160.) The vague reports, now floating dimly round, as to the time of man's creation, cannot for an instant shake this testimony of nature. The more Nature has been searched, the more witness has she borne to the Genesis of Moses. The believer in his Bible can never doubt, that the more she is searched, the more like evidence she will afford. God's Work, ever has been, ever is, and ever will be, harmonious with his Word.

Nunquam aliud Natura, aliud Sapientia dicit."* (Juv. xiv. 321.)

To return, however, from this digression, which the reader is recommended to skip. Whoever has taken the Bible in his right hand and Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch in his left, cannot fail to see, both where the fallacy of his argument lies, and the consequent falsity of his conclusions. His deductions from Moses, unlike his deductions from Euclid, are from first to last, wrong. The same error all through

* The writer begs humbly to suggest this as a motto for Sir C. Lyell's forthcoming work.

vitiates his demonstrations. Everywhere it is the application of a test to history with which history has nothing to do. It is taking the words of history, not in a *literal* sense, but with a more than mathematical precision. We say, with a more than mathematical precision, for what we have already said was no exaggeration at all, but sober truth; namely, that if the Bishop applied his test to Euclid, Euclid must fall. The Bishop evidently looks on the omission of a petty detail by an historian, as a sin as unpardonable as the leaving out a step of a geometrical demonstration, or a term of an algebraic expansion. Thus, when the historian tells us that God miraculously fed more than two million men in the wilderness, but does not think it necessary to say how the sheep were fed; therefore, is the Bishop's conclusion, they could not have been fed at all. So again, if he tell us that the flocks and herds went down into Egypt, because he mentions no shepherds; therefore they had none. If he tell a miraculous doing, but does not specify the miracle; therefore none was performed. With regard to this last point, we must again affirm, spite of the Bishop and Canon Stanley combined, that where miraculous events happened, there there was, and must have been, miraculous interference. In short, we believe the words at the end of the Gospel are equally suitable in their sense for the end of the Pentateuch, "There are also many other things which (God did by Moses) and which are not written in this book" (John xxi. 25). So too in the Bishop's sight, every word in a history, is an arithmetical quantity of fixed and determinate value, and can mean nothing more nor less, even when qualified by the historian himself. "With Jacob" means the same instant of time with him, though the historian shows plainly that not such is his meaning. Rameses, again—but we will say no more about *that*. "All the firstborn" means the whole population, though the historian himself gives us his limit. It is plain, that in arguing thus, the Bishop has been carried away by his mathematical pursuits. He has been a mathematician all his life;

> "While yet a child, and erst unknown to fame,
> He lisped in *numbers*, and the numbers came;"

and hence he treats history like a bad sum in arithmetic. Such criticism, however, cannot be allowed. The sacred subject that is treated here, forces it candidly to be spoken out, that such a method is only an extravagant Quixotism, and amounts to a decided fit of mathematical monomania.* And it is necessary to say this, because many a reader of his work observes that the calculations amount to a demonstration, but *does not* always observe, that the application of them is absurd and unwarrantable. We hope, instead of Part II. on the Pentateuch, the Bishop will favour the world with a short and clear solution of a little difficulty still existing in his friend Euclid himself, viz., the 12th axiom—that *lucus a non lucendo*, of the first book. For we really have been able to draw no other deduction from Part I., than that the fact of being a great mathematician, does not imply of necessity, being a great theologian. Duty, not inclination, and the solemn importance of the subject, compel us to be thus out-spoken; and to point out unreservedly, the childishness of the Bishop's Objections, and the absurdity of his arguments. And the same weighty motives are our claim on the reader's indulgence—

Da veniam scriptis, quorum non gloria nobis
Causa; sed utilitas, officiumque fuit.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Laying aside the "we" employed in the character of a Reviewer, I must now take leave to add a few words on my own part. I have endeavoured in these pages, to do that which the Bishop desires, "test *fairly* and *honestly* the truth

* Edie Ochiltree to Monkbarns. "I hae aye said ahiut your back, that for a' the nonsense maggots that ye whiles take into your head, ye are the maist scientific o' a' our Colonial Bishops."—Walter Scott, *slightly altered.*

of every inference he has drawn." I have tried to set forth his objections and arguments in all fairness and impartiality. Where I have disputed his conclusions, I have put forth and noticed every one of his arguments; at least I believe so; though writing in the midst of perpetual interruptions, such may not quite be the case. More than that, I have searched out Scripture and not without a reproaching and sorrowful spirit, in the way of a doubter; like a sceptic hunting for vermin in cleanly places, trying to muddy crystal waters. It has been said to me by a friend who has read the manuscript, that I have sometimes indulged in lightness. It may be so, but I have written no more than what the subject before it must obviously impress upon the mind. And I cannot alter it; for I have an eye to those ungodly jesters already alluded to in the preface. Derision, I thought, might stop their profaning mouths, where argument would not. Ridicule, not Reason, is the rod of ribalds.

The view I have taken of Mosaic history, is, what I shall take leave to call the *common sense* view. It is the view which any man, not greatly below the average of common sense,—the view that a plain countryman, who reads his Bible, *and thinks on what he reads*,—would and does take. He, and even a child, can perceive in a moment, that the events of the Exodus are not such as can happen in ordinary life. Yet reading all through, that God's voice and God's hand, were working things out, no doubt of their truth ever enters his mind. This, the reader will soon see, is all I have done. I have sought out no learning, nor puzzled God's word with complications of science. I have varnished over no text; supposed no errors of scribes; and rated the numbers even higher than Bishop Colenso. I have taken Scripture in its simple, grammatical, and literal sense; and, except where other Scripture forbade, interpreted it with a precision, almost as severe as the Bishop himself. The result of my studies has been—what I pray God it may be to each one of my readers,—that my belief in the Pentateuch has deepened into the conviction, fixed as the decrees of Fate,

that it is not only a true and faithful, genuine and authentic, but also a *literal* History. Every fact that lies around us confirms this conviction. The mighty pyramids of Egypt, which attest the labours of swarming populations, bear witness to the numbers at the Exodus epoch. The three stones in the wall of Baalbec—that Sphynx of modern engineers—which wild Arabs still hold as set up by the Geni of Solomon; prove that his legions of Lebanon workmen, was no fiction of poetry. The Bible, more especially the Mosaic law, has commanded such ages of belief, and resisted such ages of assault, as no work of man ever has done, or ever can do. The Jew, who of yore, wept by Babylon's waters, the Law's worship at Sion, still clings to it now, in far deeper misfortune, with unshaken fidelity. Neither man's weakness, and neither his wickedness, have loosened one stone in God's Temple of Truth. Thousands of errors have blemished the text; all have marred not one doctrine of Catholic Faith. And Pride, that hateth instruction; Vice, that hateth reproof, have spat on it foul venom, time out of mind. Silent and quiet, through revolving generations, the Word of God pursues its course. As is His natural, so is His spiritual world. As earth maintains her voiceless path; as planets and stars, sweep onward for aye in their noiseless roll; so the Word of the Lord endureth for ever, "rejoicing as a giant to run his course." Thus Scripture, like "the heavens, declare the glory of God;" the Bible "showeth, like the firmament, His handiwork." Though there be "neither speech nor language, yet their voices are heard among them," declaring that "underneath them are the everlasting arms." Unheard to mortal ear, unseen to mortal eye, God's hand upholds God's Word. This, this is a miracle. This is God Himself preserving his own eternal, immaterial kingdom; fulfilling the words of his own Blessed Son—"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

THE END.

While the above has been going through the press, an advertisement has appeared, announcing the Bishop's Part II. on the Age and Authority of the Writings of Moses and Joshua, as nearly ready. This is altogether overleaping the limits of the ludicrous. If we have only laughed hitherto, we do so now on the other side of the mouth, with sorrow and shame. The Bishop must know that there are many men in the Church, who have given themselves up to life-long poverty, in order to lift their feeble arms to "fight the good fight of faith." These men, very simply perhaps, but still somewhat naturally, expect to see their spiritual commanders in the forefront of battle. And there, thank God, our Bishops have always been, heretofore. It is impossible to witness unmoved, one of their sacred order, not merely forsaking his colors, but doing all he can to hand them over to the enemy. No clergyman, who has the least respect for his cloth, can see without sorrow, such a scandal cast on it. The Bishop has no right to expect any man to pay him the respect of reading his words, so long as he writes them in lawn sleeves. (See Bishop of London's Charge, p. 17.)

There is, however, one comfort in the forthcoming publication, though it be but a poor one. Judging from Part I., and also from the subject of Part II., we may expect something unspeakably absurd when the work is brought forth. "*Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*" A somewhat larger animal than Horace's mouse may indeed be expected to appear; there being such very decided symptoms, as we have seen, of "a rat in the garret." There is a little preliminary matter too, which the Bishop must settle, as a base of operations. He must first prove that the Parthenon was built yesterday, and the Pyramids the day before; we may then be prepared to listen to his sentiments as to the date of the Mosaic writings—but not till then.

R. E. Peach, Printer, 8, Bridge Street, Bath.

DATE DUE

JUL 4 '75			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Syracuse, N. Y.
Stacktan, Calif.

BS1225.4 .C7F8
Vindex Pentateuchi : an answer
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00039 7234